



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 3PKQ F

Period

188

Bd. Feb. 1909.



Harvard University
Library of the Divinity School

GIFT OF

The Harvard
Theological Review.
22 June - 7 Oct. 1908.

354

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly

EDITOR

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANK H. FOSTER, D. W. SIMON, JAMES LINDSAY, HUGH M. SCOTT

CHARLES F. THWING, NEWELL DWIGHT HILLIS, A. A. BERLE

W. E. BARTON, W. E. PARK, H. A. STIMSON

H. W. MAGOUN

VOL. LXV

OBERLIN, OHIO

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

CHARLES HIGHAM & SON, LONDON

1908

22 June - 7 Oct. 1905.

Box 18A

CONTENTS OF VOL. LXV.

NO. CCLVII.

I.	CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.....	1
	BY DR. J. M. S. BALJON, UTRECHT UNIVERSITY, THE NETHERLANDS.	
II.	BRUNETIERE AND THE NOVEL OF REAL LIFE..	40
	BY THE REVEREND HENRY A. STIMSON, D.D., NEW YORK, N. Y.	
III.	SCIENCE AND HIGHER CRITICISM.....	57
	BY HONORABLE F. J. LAMB, MADISON, WISCONSIN.	
IV.	SOME PERILS OF CURRENT VIEWS OF IMMANENCE	87
	BY THE REV. GEORGE S. ROLLINS, D.D., SPRINGFIELD, MASS.	
V.	"ISRAEL'S LAWS AND LEGAL PRECEDENTS"....	97
	BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., BARRISTER-AT-LAW, LINCOLN'S INN, LONDON.	
VI.	ENGLISH DRAMATIC VERSE AFTER SHAKESPEARE	132
	BY PROFESSOR THEODORE W. HUNT, PH.D., LITT.D., PRINCETON, N. J.	
VII.	THE ETHICAL FACTOR IN POLITICS.....	148
	BY THE REVEREND FRANCIS LITTLE HAYES, D.D., TOPEKA, KANSAS.	
VIII.	CRITICAL NOTES	158
	Romantic Psychologizing. A. A. Berle.....	158
	The "Fourth Day" in Genesis. H. W. Magoun.....	169
	A Jewish Temple in Egypt, B.C. 525-411.....	170

IX. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.....	174
Christian Theology in Outline, by W. A. Brown (A. T. Swing).—Unbelief in the Nineteenth Century, by H. C. Sheldon (A. T. S.).—History of English Congregationalism, by R. W. Dale (A. T. S.).—A Short History of American Presbyterianism.—Rudolf Eucken's Philosophy of Life, by W. R. B. Gibson (J. Lindsay).—The Religious Conception of the World, by A. K. Rogers.—Jesus Christ and the Civilization of To-day, by J. A. Leighton (A. T. S.).—Essays in Pastoral Medicine, by A. O'Malley (E. M. Merrins).—Christianity and the Social Crisis, by W. Rauschenbusch.—The Church and the Changing Order, by S. Mathews.—The Ancestry of our English Bible, by I. M. Price.—The Teachings of Jesus in Parables, by G. H. Hubbard.—Gospel Development, by C. T. Ward.—Ancient Masters and Jesus, by W. B. Hartzog.—Tent and Testament, by H. Rix.—A Summary of the Literatures of Modern Europe, by M. Edwards (J. L.).—Books Received.	

NO. CCLVIII.

I. WHITTIER AS MAN, POET, AND REFORMER.....	186
BY F. B. SANBORN, CONCORD, MASS.	
II. "SUFFER LITTLE CHILDREN, AND FORBID THEM NOT, TO COME UNTO ME".....	214
BY HUGH K. WAGNER, ESQ., ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.	
III. THE RISE OF THE TOLERATION MOVEMENT.....	249
BY FRANKLIN C. CLARK, A.M., M.D., PROVIDENCE, R. I.	
IV. UNIVERSITIES AND SOCIAL ADVANCE.....	306
BY THE REVEREND A. A. BERLE, D.D., SALEM, MASS.	
V. CAN SECULARISM DO IT?.....	381
BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM HARRISON, CORNWALL, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, CANADA.	
VI. FALSE BIOLOGY AND FATALISM.....	368
BY THE REVEREND JOHN T. GULICK, SC.D., HONOLULU, T. H.	

VII. NOTES	368
The Poverty and Vice of London. G. Frederick Wright.	368
Use and Abuse of Apologetics. Abraham Kuyper....	374
Theological Unrest in England.....	379
The Removal of Andover Seminary. William Edwards Park	386
VIII. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.....	388
Ehe- und Familienrecht der Hebräer, by T. Engert (H. M. Wiener).—Old Testament Problems, by J. W. Thirtle.—Die Apostolischen Väter: Clemens, Hermas, Barnabas, by D. Völtner (A. T. S.).—Choix de Textes Religieux Assyro-Babyloniens, by P. Dhorme (G. A. Barton).—A Study of the Earliest Letters of Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig (A. S. Root).—Luther's Table Talk, by P. Smith (A. T. S.).—Life in the Homeric Age, by T. D. Seymour (C. B. Martin).—Woman, by J. Donaldson (W. Dennison).	

NO. CCLIX.

I. THE PLAGUES OF EGYPT (I.).....	401
BY EDWARD M. MERRINS, M.D., EAST ORANGE, N. J.	
II. THE SAMARITAN SABBATH.....	430
BY JACOB, SON OF AARON, HIGH PRIEST OF THE SAMARITANS AT SHECHEM.	
III. PROFESSOR MOORE ON MINISTERIAL TRAINING.	445
BY THE REVEREND A. A. BERLE, D.D., BOSTON, MASS.	
IV. THE PREACHER AND HIS TIMES.....	452
BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM J. HUTCHINS, OBERLIN, OHIO.	
V. THE EXPERT MINISTER, AND HIS TRAINING OF HIS LAYMEN	465
BY PROFESSOR GEORGE WALTER FISKE, OBERLIN, OHIO.	
VI. ESSAYS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM (I.).....	481
BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., LINCOLN'S INN, LONDON.	

VII. THE UNITAS FRATRUM.....	510
BY PROFESSOR LOUIS F. MISKOVSKY, OBERLIN, OHIO. L	
VIII. HOMER AND THE HIGHER CRITICS.....	531
BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM WALLACE EVERTS, BOSTON, MASS.	
IX. THE PROGRESS AND PRESENT STATUS OF TRI- CHURCH UNION.	557
BY LUCIEN C. WARNER, LL.D., NEW YORK, N. Y.	
X. EVOLUTION AND THE MIRACULOUS.....	572
BY PROFESSOR GABRIEL CAMPBELL, HANOVER, N. H.	
XI. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.....	586
History of Babylonia and Assyria, by H. Winckler.— The Early Traditions of Genesis, by A. R. Gordon. — <i>Coutumes des Arabes au Pays de Moab</i> , by A. Jaussen (G. A. B.).— <i>Legal and Commercial Trans-</i> <i>actions</i> , by A. T. Clay.— <i>Systematic Theology</i> , by A. H. Strong.— <i>History of the Christian</i> , by P. Schaff.— <i>A History of the Christian Church</i> , by S. Cheetham.— <i>The Cities of St. Paul</i> , by W. M. Ramsay.— <i>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary</i> <i>on the Gospel according to S. Matthew</i> , by W. C. Allen.— <i>A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels</i> , by J. Hastings.— <i>The Dated Events of the Old Testa-</i> <i>ment</i> , by W. J. Beecher.— <i>Between the Testaments</i> , by D. Gregg.— <i>Life and Light</i> .— <i>Positive Preaching</i> <i>and Modern Mind</i> , by P. T. Forsyth.— <i>What Shall I</i> <i>Believe</i> .— <i>The Christ that is to be</i> .— <i>The Significance</i> <i>of the Personality of Christ for the Minister of To-</i> <i>day</i> .— <i>History of Ancient Civilization</i> , by C. Selg- nobos.— <i>The Inquisition in the Spanish Dependen-</i> <i>cies</i> , by H. C. Lea.— <i>A History of the United States</i> <i>and its People</i> , by E. M. Avery.— <i>Roman Constitu-</i> <i>tional History</i> , by J. E. Granrud (H. W. M.).— <i>The</i> <i>Inward Light</i> , by H. F. Hall.— <i>The Churchman</i> .	

NO. CCLX.

I. THE ALLEGED COLLAPSE OF NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY	601
--	-----

II. THE PLAGUES OF EGYPT (II.).....	611
BY EDWARD M. MERRINS, M.D., EAST ORANGE, NEW JERSEY.	
III. RECOLLECTIONS OF LINCOLN.....	636
BY HONORABLE J. O. CUNNINGHAM, URBANA, ILLINOIS.	
IV. THE REAL DATE OF THE GOSPELS.....	657
BY THE REVEREND PARKE P. FLOURNOY, D.D., BETHESDA, MD.	
V. A REMARKABLE CLAIM ON BEHALF OF THE RADICAL CRITICISM	679
BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM MARCELLUS M'PHEETERS, D.D., COLUMBIA, S. C.	
VI. CIRCUMCISION AMONG THE SAMARITANS.....	694
BY JACOB, SON OF AARON, HIGH PRIEST OF THE SAMARITANS AT SHECHEM.	
VII. REFLECTIONS IN ROME.....	711
BY THE REVEREND JAMES LINDSAY, D.D., KILMARNOCK, SCOTLAND.	
VIII. ESSAYS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM (II.)....	723
BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., LINCOLN'S INN, LONDON.	
IX. NOTES	755
Justification by Faithfulness: The True Doctrine of Jesus and Paul. A. B. Curtis.....	
Ground of Authority in Religion.....	
The Sacrifice of Christ as a Ransom Paid to the Devil. Henry A. Stimson.....	
X. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.....	763
Jerusalem, by G. A. Smith.—Light from Egyptian Papyri, by C. H. H. Wright.—A History of the An- cient Egyptians, by J. H. Breasted.—The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowl- edge.—The Irenaeus Testimony to the Fourth Gos- pel, by F. G. Lewis.—Philosophical Basis of Reli- gion, by J. Watson.—Roots of Reality, by E. B. Bax. —Etudes sur la Doctrine de Dieu, by P. Lobstein	

(F. W. Hass).—*Aux Croyants et aux Athées*, by W. Monod (F. W. H.).—*La Notion de l'Esprit*, by J. Arnal (F. W. H.).—*Christ and the Eternal Order*, by J. W. Buckham.—*Jesus Christ the Son of God*, by W. M. Macgregor.—*The Lord of Glory*, by B. B. Warfield.—*New Horoscope of Missions*, by J. S. Dennis.—*The Philosophy of Loyalty*, by J. Royce.—*Wycliffe and the Lollards*, by J. C. Carrick.—*God's Choice of Men*, by W. R. Richards.—*The Church of To-day*, by J. H. Crooker.—*Sunday-Schools the World Around*.

INDEX 777

IN THE APRIL NUMBER, DR. BERLE WILL BEGIN ANOTHER SERIES
"ASPECTS OF SPIRITUAL DEMOCRACY," THE FIRST TITLE
"UNIVERSITIES AND THE SOCIAL LIFE."

SEVENTY-EIGHTH YEAR.

JUN 22 1908 JANUARY

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly

EDITOR

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

ASSOCIATED WITH

FRANK H. FOSTER, D. W. SIMON, JAMES LINDSAY, HUGH M. S.
CHARLES F. THWING, NEWELL DWIGHT HILLIS, A. A. BERLE
WILLIAM E. BARTON, WILLIAM EDWARDS PARK,
HENRY A. STIMSON.

CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.	J. M. S. Baljo
BRUNETIÈRE AND THE NOVEL OF REAL LIFE.	Henry A. Stimson
SCIENCE AND HIGHER CRITICISM.	F. J. Lam
SOME PERILS OF CURRENT VIEWS OF IMMANENCE.	George S. Rollin
"ISRAEL'S LAWS AND LEGAL PRECEDENTS."	Harold M. Wiener
ENGLISH DRAMATIC VERSE AFTER SHAKESPEARE.	Theodore W. Hur
THE ETHICAL FACTOR IN POLITICS.	Francis Little Hay
NOTES.	
ROMANTIC PSYCHOLOGIZING.	A. A. Ber
THE "FOURTH DAY" IN GENESIS.	H. W. Magou
A JEWISH TEMPLE IN EGYPT, B.C. 525-411.	
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.	

OBERLIN, OHIO, U. S. A.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

SINGLE NUMBER, 75 CENTS.

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$3

THE RECORDS OF THE PAST.

CONTENTS—Volume V., 1906.

- Inscription at Dog River, Syria (1 Illustration.) By Prof. G. Frederick Wright.
Cliff Ruins of Northern Mexico (8 Illustrations.) By A. H. Blackiston.
The Pyramids of Zamna and Kabul (2 Illustrations.) By Srita. Natalie von Schenck.
Stone Effigies of Southern Russia (3 Illustrations.) By Herr Vladimir Riedel.
Researches in Palestine (7 Illustrations.) By Rev. Llewellyn L. Henson, D. D.
The Archæological Museum of Florence, Italy (3 Illustrations.) By Prof. G. Frederick Wright.
The Palestine Exploration Fund. By Rev. Theodore Wright, Ph. D.
Among the Sun-Temples of Coele-Syria (13 Illustrations.) By Rev. Benjamin W. Bacon, D. D., LL. D.
The Eolithic Problem. By Prof. Henry W. Haynes.
Another Ancient Flint Quarry near Seneca, Missouri. By W. C. Barnard, M. D.
The "Cenotes" of Yucatan (1 Illustration.) By Srita. Natalie von Schenck.
The Pillager Indians (4 Illustrations.) By Mr. Frank Abial Flower.
Augustus' Altar of Peace (4 Illustrations.) By Prof. James C. Egbert, Ph. D.
Sancta Maria Antiqua (5 Illustrations.) By Prof. James C. Egbert, Ph. D.
The Origin and Antiquity of Man. By Mr. Warren Upham.
Casas Grandian Outposts (8 Illustrations.) By A. H. Blackiston.
Prehistoric Places around Couvin, Belgium (1 Illustration.) By Baron Alfred De Loe.
Sacred Springs in the Southwest (U. S.) (4 Illustrations.) By Mr. Walter Hough.
Roman Terra-cotta Lamps (6 Illustrations.) By Prof. Edward W. Clark.
Important Discoveries by Dr. Petrie. By Rev. William Copley Winslow, D. C. L.
The Cedars of Lebanon (8 Illustrations.) By Prof. G. Frederick Wright.
The Birth of Venus: A Greek Relief and a Renaissance Painting (2 Illustrations.) By Prof. Samuel Allen Jeffers.
Documents from the Temple Archives of Nippur (12 Illustrations.) By Mr. D. D. Luckenbill.
The Bismya Temple (11 Illustrations.) By Mr. Edgar James Banks.
Mound Builders of the Mississippi Valley (3 Illustrations.) By Mr. Richard Herrmann.
Petrie's Work in the Delta. By Rev. William Copley Winslow, D. C. L.
Submerged Trees in the Columbia River (3 Illustrations.) By Prof. G. Frederick Wright.
The Mosque of Isa Bey at Ephesus (6 Illustrations.) By A. E. Henderson, R. B. A.
Green Lake and its Mounds (12 Illustrations.) By Rev. Horatio Gates.
The Hyksos. By W. M. Flinders Petrie, D. C. L., F. R. S.
The Pajarito Ruins: Their Accessibility (4 Illustrations.) By Mr. Hugh H. Harris.
Prehistoric Village Site, Ross County, Ohio (14 Illustrations.) By Mr. William C. Mills.
The City of the Creed (12 Illustrations.) By Miss Isabel Frances Dodd.
The Shell Heaps of Florida (6 Illustrations.) By Rev. Charles De Wolfe Brower.
Recent Archæological Legislation. By Prof. Francis W. Kelsey, Ph. D.
The Dome of St. Sergius and Bacchus at Constantinople (5 Illustrations.) By Allan Marquand, Ph. D.
Ancient American "Free Delivery." By Frank Abial Flower.
Mound Builders of the Mississippi Valley (2 Illustrations.) By Richard Herrmann.
The Fortress of Masada (4 Illustrations.) By Frederick Bennett Wright.

VOLUME I

NUMBER 1

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

JANUARY, 1908

CONTENTS

THE CALL TO THEOLOGY	<i>Francis G. Peabody</i>
MODERN IDEAS OF GOD	<i>Arthur C. McGiffert</i>
IS OUR PROTESTANTISM STILL PROTESTANT?	<i>William Adams Brown</i>
A TURNING POINT IN SYNOPTIC CRITICISM	<i>Benjamin W. Bacon</i>
RECENT EXCAVATIONS IN PALESTINE	<i>David G. Lyon</i>
THE ECONOMIC BASIS OF THE PROBLEM OF EVIL	<i>Thomas N. Carver</i>
THE DIVINE PROVIDENCE	<i>Charles F. Dole</i>

ISSUED QUARTERLY BY
THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1908

Subscription Price, \$2.00 a Year

Single Copies, 50 Cents

Specimen copies on application to the Editors, Cambridge, Mass.



Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain our opinion free whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. HANDBOOK on Patents sent free. Oldest agency for securing patents. Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive special notice, without charge, in the

Scientific American.

A handsomely illustrated weekly. Largest circulation of any scientific journal. Terms, \$3 a year; four months, \$1. Sold by all newsdealers. **MUNN & Co.** 361 Broadway, New York
Branch Office, 625 F St., Washington, D. C.

Librarians

Please observe that we
are prepared to fill out
incomplete sets of

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

at special prices.

Bibliotheca Sacra Co.
OBERLIN :: OHIO

Lantern Slides on Biblical Archaeology

For Rent and For Sale

We have a fine list of lantern slides illustrating Biblical Archaeology which will interest every Clergyman who uses the Stereopticon in his Church work. The Series includes discoveries in the Tigris-Euphrates Valley, Persia, Asia Minor, Palestine, Syria, Egypt and Rome, bearing on Biblical Archaeology.

If you are interested, write us for lists and prices.

Records of the Past
330 A Street Southeast

Three Series of Lantern Slides

Glacial Series

75 Views—\$30.00

Including existing Glaciers from all parts of the world. Glacial Deposits, Maps and Diagrams.

Man and the Glacial Period

Complete Series—100 Views—\$40.00

Including existing Glaciers, Glacial Deposits, Human Remains found beneath Glacial Deposits, Maps and Diagrams.

Man and the Glacial Period

Abridged Series—60 Views—\$24.00

This series is accompanied by an introduction, and a complete description of the views, maps and diagrams written by Prof. G. F. Wright, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A. A list of these slides will be furnished on application.

Single Slides from these Series, 50 cents

Exploration Society
Washington, D. C.

The American Economic Association

The publications of the Association were begun in 1886, and have continued to appear in various forms and series. They number twenty-five complete volumes to the close of 1906, and include many of the most important monographs on economics that have appeared in America. A complete list will be sent on application to the addresses below. Recent numbers are as follows:

THIRD SERIES.

Volume VI, 1906.

- No. 1. Seventeenth Annual Meeting. Part I. Presidential Address: Present position of the doctrine of free trade, F. W. Taussig; The theory of money; Papers by J. Laurence Laughlin, David Kinley, A. Piatt Andrew. Discussion. Open Shop or Closed Shop? Papers by John R. Commons, John Graham Brooks, John Hibbard, Thomas Kidd. Discussion. Pp. 228. Price, \$1.00.
- No. 2. Seventeenth Annual Meeting. Part II. Governmental Interference with industrial combination, E. B. Whitney; Regulation of railway rates, M. A. Knapp; Taxation of railways, H. C. Adams and W. A. Baldwin; Preferential tariffs and reciprocity, A. Short, G. F. Foster, and A. W. Flux; Inclosure Movement, E. F. Gray; Economic history of the United States, C. D. Wright. Pp. 27. Price, \$1.00.
- No. 3. The History and Theory of Shipping Subsidies. By Royal Meeker. Pp. 230. Price, \$1.00.
- No. 4. History of Labor Legislation in New York. By F. R. Fairchild. Pp. 218. Price, \$1.00.

VOLUME VII, 1906.

- No. 1. Eighteenth Annual Meeting: Papers and Discussions on Theory of Distribution; Government Regulation of Railway Rates (2); Municipal Ownership (2); Labor Disputes (2); The Economic Future of the Negro (2). Pp. 325. Price, \$1.00.
- No. 2. Railroad Rate Control. By H. S. Smalley. Pp. 145. Price, \$1.00.
- No. 3. On Collective Phenomena and the Scientific Value of Statistical Data. By Dr. Gryzanowski. Pp. 47. Price, 75 cents.
- No. 4. The Taxation of Gross Receipts of Railways in Wisconsin. By Guy Edward Snider. Pp. 138. Price, \$1.00.

VOLUME VIII, 1907.

- No. 1. Eighteenth Annual Meeting. Presidential Address: The Modern Standard of Business Honor, J. W. Jenks; Wages as fixed by Arbitration, J. B. Clark and others; Higher Commercial Education, J. F. Johnson and others; Money and Banking, M. L. Muhleman; Western Civilization and the Birth Rate, E. A. Ross and others; Government Regulation of Insurance, M. H. Robinson and others; the Protective Tariff and the Trusts; the Extent of Child Labor in the United States. Pp. 266. Price, \$1.00.
- No. 2. Historical Sketch of the Finances and Financial Policy of Massachusetts. From 1780 to 1906. By Charles J. Bullock. Pp. 144. Price, \$1.00.

Address subscriptions, applications for membership, and inquiries to the Secretary of the American Economic Association, Princeton, N. J.

Address all orders, except subscriptions, to the publishers,

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY,

66 Fifth Avenue, New York.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

The Oldest Theological Quarterly in America

Prof. G. Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D., Editor

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Rev. Frank H. Foster, D.D., Ph.D., Olivet, Michigan.

Rev. James Lindsay, D.D., Kilmarnock, Scotland.

Rev. D. W. Simon, D.D., Bradford, England.

Rev. Hugh M. Scott, D.D., Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Charles F. Thwing, D.D., Pres. Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rev. A. A. Berle, D.D., Salem, Mass.

Rev. W. E. Barton, D.D., Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Henry A. Stimson, D.D., New York City.

Rev. William Edwards Park, D.D., Oberlin, Ohio.

¶ As heretofore the *Bibliotheca Sacra* will aim to meet the wants of the more intelligent public, both lay and clerical of all denominations, in the publication of thorough discussions of all topics of permanent interest touching the Christian religion. Prominence will continue to be given to Biblical Criticism in its various departments; Theology in its doctrinal, historical and practical aspects; and the Relation of Philosophy, Science, and Oriental Discoveries to the Bible.

¶ In addition to the continued interest of the able corps of Associate Editors, special advantages may be expected to result the coming year from the fact that Dr. Simon is to take up his permanent residence in Germany, and hence will be able to furnish fresh information from the center of intellectual movements.

¶ On account of the freedom of the Editor from the routine duties of his professorship, he will be able to give increased attention to the interests of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and adapt it still more perfectly to the deepest needs of the time. The *Quarterly* will continue its elaborate and conservative discussion of the great sociological questions that are agitating the century, but will, as heretofore, be devoted mainly to discussions by competent authorities of the profound theological and critical problems which are agitating the entire Christian public. While remaining loyal to the historic faith of Christendom, it will aim to welcome and aid all real progress in every department of human activity. On account of its long standing, and its undenominational character, the *Bibliotheca Sacra* probably has a wider circulation than any other American publication. Through it the ablest writers can at once reach every center of thought in the world. While not aiming at ephemeral popularity, in a marked degree it accomplishes the purpose of influencing the thought that in the end moves the world. Whatever periodicals of a more popular character are taken by pastors, theological students, and the more intelligent laymen, such thorough discussions as appear in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* are indispensable to a complete mastery of the great themes that are constantly coming to the surface in modern thought.

Address,

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, *Oberlin, O.*

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

ARTICLE I.

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.¹

BY DR. J. M. S. BALJON, PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY IN
UTRECHT UNIVERSITY, THE NETHERLANDS.

THE inquiry after the origin of things has always claimed in large measures the attention of serious and thoughtful minds. This proves the philosophical disposition of man. It will not do that we can describe and determine a phenomenon: we also want to know how it became what it is. We desire not only to know the river in its course and to picture the beautiful pasture-lands and valleys through which it flows, but we desire also to know its origin, the very place from which it comes. No atomistic view of history will pacify us, nor the simple description of persons and conditions alongside of and after one another, which is the history merely of most patent facts. We demand an organic, historic view. We want to understand the life of the nations,—the private, hidden, and social life. We want to interpret that life, among other things, from the life, the thought, and the labors of preceding generations. Our civilization must be interpreted from the factors which now make their influence felt, and also from

¹Translated from the Dutch by the Reverend John Hendrik de Vries, D.D., Saybrook, Conn.

those of bygone ages. And, applied to religion, this means that, more than ever, the theologian directs his attention to the private, spiritual life of the people, which we call piety.

Does not theology root in the life of the people, and is it not the reflection of what there takes place? The historic view of the theologian has involuntarily come under the influence of the general historic view, and is daily under its power.

The two departments in which it is my honor to serve this University—New Testament Exegesis and Patristic Literature—might be classed as a separate rubric in the encyclopedia of Christian Theology, viz., under the so-called Literary Theology, but they sustain a sympathetic relation to Historic Theology. An exegete who understands his task does not rest content with questions of grammar and textual criticism, but strives to have an historical understanding of what he has read, and to grasp its historical background and temper. Thus life and animation are imparted to the material he handles. We who are exegetes and critics have also come under the influence of the general trend of our times and are bound to reckon with it. He who discerns the signs of the times knows that the spirit of the times is not favorably disposed to pure exegesis and critical studies. Since New Testament exegetes and critics have frequently seemed blind against the fact that, however interesting, as studies, textual criticism, exegesis, and introduction are, they never can be an end in themselves, but merely serve as preparatory steps to the higher aim, viz., the history of primitive Christianity,—which enables us to understand the life and thought of primitive Christendom, of the leaders and of the peoples, of apostles and of prophets, and also of the masses of the people that know not the law,—the reaction has not remained want-

ing. And yet, however much these studies may suffer neglect at many hands, their defense lies not in my province at this time. This has been well done from this place on other occasions, and no one really questions any longer the necessity of such investigations. Rather let me direct your attention to an effort which is widely put forth in our times; to wit, to call in the aid of the history of religions to interpret the origin of representations, usages, and morals of the primitive Christians. For here we have to do with a new method of interpretation of the origin of many representations of original Christianity and with a new method of work in the studies of the New Testament.

The whole civilized world has been moved by the well-known Babel-Bible conflict. Representations of the Old Testament, narratives of the Creation and of the Flood, laws and customs, angelology and demonology, as well as eschatological representations, it is said, must needs be interpreted by the theology of the surrounding nations, especially Babylonian, Persian, or Egyptian. This thought is not entirely new to us. Years ago the definite results of this study were in evidence. Now, however, the attention is directed to it more than formerly and the public at large takes more notice of it. This same method of interpretation is now applied to the New Testament, in the interpretation of many narratives from the life of Jesus as well as of the Epistles and the Apocalypse of St. John. This is called in Germany the *religionsgeschichtliche Methode*. I know of no adequate expression for this in our language, but would formulate my theme something like this: "The Aid which the Study of the History of Religions provides for the Study of the New Testament."

When even Christian dogma must needs be interpreted not

merely by Old Testament representations, the individuality of eminent Christian thinkers, the influence of the life of Christian communion, but also from less definite Israelitish or Christian thought, and particularly by the inworking of Hellenistic philosophy, how much easier is this "religionsgeschichtliche Methode" applied to the New Testament narratives! Numerous analogies can here be indicated from ordinary, profane literature.

It is a known fact that many stories and folk lores which were current in Europe during the middle ages must be explained by Indian influences. The Christian narrative of Barlaam and Josophat is of Indian origin. Consciously or unconsciously the East affected the West and the West adopted many things from the East, the influence of which is still felt in our own days. Thus this so-called "religionsgeschichtliche Methode" is not entirely new to us who are students of the New Testament. Forsooth there is little new under the sun. In the first place, it has been applied already for some time to the Apocalypse of St. John; and I add at once, that it was done with benefit. But also, with reference to the whole New Testament, it was mentioned in the Rationalistic period at the end of the eighteenth century, when it was in vogue to point out parallel narratives from antiquity, by which to show that Christian truth is intelligent, *vernunftmässig*, and to posit theology as the so-called liberal theology.

Yea, I may go back still further. Justin Martyr, one of the earliest Christian apologetes, and soon others in his wake, in order to make Christian truth acceptable to pagans, pointed out the analogy, for instance, of Jesus' birth with that of heroes and sons of gods, and thereby actually put the narratives concerning this on the same line. When in other religions, such as for instance in the wide-spread cult of Mithras, these

apologetes found customs and representations which reminded them of Christian baptism and the Lord's Supper, they explained them by the influence of demons, who by analogous heathen representations sought to deceive good Christians, and turn them from the faith. This is indeed no scientific interpretation; but I name these incidents, in order to show that even in the early centuries of our era views of similar analogies or parallels were current. Truly this was not very meritorious. To heathen students these similarities of representations must have been apparent. This is known of Celsus, the great antagonist of early Christianity.

For the sake of an intelligent and orderly treatment of our subject, let me direct your attention to a few fixed points about which there is no difference of opinion, or at least very little. Do not smile at these so-called "fixed points" in the face of the great difference of opinion which is current among theologians regarding earliest Christianity. I may at once set your minds at rest, and show that here we enter a domain which belongs to the so-called neutral zone. Here theologians of the right as well as of the left side may confidently meet one another, as in other domains, and be mutually helpful to each other. At the new Roman Catholic theological faculty at Strasburg, the first theological promotion took place upon the presentation of a theme which is borrowed from the circle of my present studies. Even they who, contrary to my view, apply a very severe theory of inspiration to the Bible, such as the ancient Jew applied to the Old Testament, and the followers of Mohammed to the Koran, even they can make use of the results of this study. That the form of divine revelation joins itself to existing forms is really self-evident. But the boundary line between the so-called profane

and sacred sciences is not so sharply drawn as some would make it appear, so that on one side all is light and on the other all darkness. He who represents it in this fashion—and our age inclines to sharp antitheses—turns the question into a caricature. A good Reformed theologian believes in the existence of what in terms of dogmatics is called “common grace.” It is likewise the rich idea of a representation of Christian antiquity, that when Christ descends into Sheol, according to the well-known doctrine of the *descensus ad infernos*, not merely the patriarchs, but also Plato and other noble philosophers, go forth to meet their Lord, and voice their feelings of gladness at his appearing. Truth, wherever found, is of God. *Anima naturaliter Christiano.*

As belonging to the fixed points, I reckon with the following: The Gospel of St. John begins with the beautiful prologue, which is classic of content and sober of form: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehendeth it not.” Here we have the known doctrine of the Logos, developed in the prologue of the Fourth Gospel and which I take to be the subject of the entire Gospel. This thema is summarized in the well-known verse: “And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.” This Logos doctrine is derived from the Logos doctrine of Philo, the well-known Hellenist. Although this philosopher was a Jew, his speculation is not immediately derived from the Old Testament, since, in its entirety, the Old Testament contains proverbs of

the wisdom of life, Chokma literature, but no formulated philosophy. Here Philo built upon foundations that were laid by Plato. The λόγος νοητικός of Philo is the *ιδέα ιδεῶν* of the well-known Greek philosopher. The revelation of God is the Logos, the embodiment of the thoughts of God. God, in so far as he reveals himself, is called Logos. The Logos, however, in so far as he reveals God, is called God. Though I recognize the great difference in the Logos doctrine between Philo and John, a difference which is immediately connected with the different idea of God as held by each,—yet, that with the progress of about five hundred years of religious development the writer of the Fourth Gospel should have derived the idea of the Logos immediately from the Old Testament seems to me very improbable. In several points, such as in its well-known antithesis between flesh and spirit, light and darkness, being from above and from beneath, the Fourth Gospel joins itself to Alexandrian Hellenism. In all honesty I do not see, not only what scientific, but also what religious difficulties can be raised to disprove the hypothesis, that, for the form of his Gospel, which by its entire structure seemed intended for cultured readers of high, spiritual standing, the evangelist attended the school of Philo.

With Paul I trace a like influence of Hellenism in his psychology and in his view of flesh and spirit, as well as in his allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, which both Jews and Christians had appropriated from the old Greeks, who tried to make the offensive narratives of Homer and Hesiod concerning the gods acceptable to the people.

I find still another fixed point, where foreign influences have affected the writers of the New Testament, in the manner of expression which Paul has derived from the language of the mysteries. It is well known that not only the ancient Greeks,

but also the founders of Mithraicism and many others, in their religious instruction made a distinction between *esoterici* and *exoterici*, the initiated and the non-initiated. Alongside of the knowledge which fell under the reach of the uninitiated, or the large multitude of people, there was also a knowledge for the more deeply trained, or initiated, who were admitted to the holy mysteries, and for which at times different degrees of knowledge were demanded.

There was either a faint impression abroad, or it was clearly perceived, that the narratives of the gods and goddesses were no pure reality, but that for the most part they were originally myths of sun, moon, and stars, which men had represented as gods. Thirst after mystic contemplation came in as another factor, together with the desire after a more substantial and more accurate knowledge. Separated from the people, in the solemn stillness of the evening hour, man was prepared to meet the divinity in a blessed ecstasy of soul. Especially in the mysteries of the later rituals of Mithras, although even in earlier times, purifications, or *lustrationes*, took place. People sat at a common table and took bread and wine, as in the Lord's Supper. Paul made no distinction among Christians between initiated and uninitiated, but he too spoke of mysteries, which were hidden until the light of Divine revelation shone upon them. The counsel of God for the salvation of the heathen and the temporary rejection of Israel were to him a mystery even as the person of Christ himself. He also knew a wisdom for the full-grown, and not for babes, a wisdom not of this world. Not the distinction of intellectual development and civilization, but the difference in spiritual development and experience, sanctioned the mention of hidden things. For children there was milk, and strong meat for the full-grown. All the children could gradually become adults.

If, among the Greeks, a seal was spoken of, by which to indicate a sacred and solemn ceremony which betokened admission to the fellowship with the divinity, Paul also speaks of baptism as of a seal, and of "a being sealed." In the early history of Christian literature the same ground was held when baptism was viewed not merely as a seal, but also as an enlightening.

But the eschatological representations form the most fixed domain, where foreign influences upon Christian thoughts are traceable. It is characteristic that many religions—such as those of the Babylonians, Persians, Egyptians, Jews, and Christians—in their representations of the beginning and end of things have uttered similar or related thoughts, and have appropriated many things one from the other. Who does not remember the cosmogonies of the ancient peoples, the flood records of Israel and Babylonia?

But to return to my subject, who is not reminded of the apocalypticist? The apocalypticist labors to unveil the mysteries of the future by the higher light, which the seer, who speaks in ecstasy or exaltation of spirit, professes to see. His spiritual eye is opened, so that he sees what another does not see. He hears what others do not hear. His voice is one of warning, but to all that of a comforter. In times of oppression and shame, of persecution and scorn, the apocalypticist is born, and the eye is fixed upon the glorious future which is at hand, when light shall overcome darkness, right triumph over wrong, and God shall wipe away all tears from the eyes. The Paradise condition is reborn and the golden age begins. Frequently the apocalypticist appears in the person of a man from the hoary past who is introduced as speaking. He views history in the light of his times, gives retrospective prophecy, to which he adds corrections appropriate to his age. It is

characteristic that the apocalypticist is more writer than seer, and that he works with old data and old material. Apocalypticists are not creators of new forms, but in old forms they express new thoughts. If the apocalypticist works with old data it is self-evident that he is not too choise in the selection of his material, and employs sacred as well as profane representations as long as they further his purpose and provide food for his imagery.

According to the Apocalypse of St. John the seer is on the Island of Patmos, to receive the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus. To the seven churches in Asia Minor he brings the greetings of peace from him who is and was and is to come, i. e. from the eternal God, who remains forever equal unto himself, and from the seven spirits before his throne. In holy ecstasy of mind he beholds the Messiah in a visionary state, with an image borrowed from Daniel, that of a Son of man, who presents himself as high priest and king, and accepts attributes which belong to God. He sees him walking among the seven golden candlesticks, holding seven stars in his right hand (Rev. i. 16). This latter circumstance, however, does not prevent the Son of man from laying his hand a little later upon John, and saying for his encouragement: "Fear not, I am the first and the last." In another vision John is admitted to the holy of holies, and he sees the throne of God, covered with glory and majesty, symbolically expressed. Lightnings and thunderings proceeded out of it. Afterwards follows the noteworthy and picturesque description: And there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven spirits of God.

In chapter v. 6 the apocalypticist speaks of the seven eyes of the Lamb, which are also said to be the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. This representation, it seems to

me, cannot be explained by the candlestick with the seven arms of Exodus xxv., nor from the candlestick seen in vision in Zachariah iv., where the prophet declares that the seven lamps are the eyes of the LORD, which run to and fro through the whole earth. Here we must needs call in the help of the star-gods of the heathen, such as those of the Babylonians and the Mithras worshippers. The Pleiads, the sun, moon, and five known planets received special homage. With Israel these gods of light became angels, high guardian angels, representatives of God. Thus it came to pass more especially with the Jews that the gods who, according to heathen faith, held sway over nations, rivers, lands, etc., were translated into guardian angels of nations, rivers, and lands. Thus we can say that the stars were taken to be the eyes of the divinity, and in public worship were represented by torches. Otherwise these symbolical representations remain inexplicable to us. That after all they cannot be fully understood, even as many other representations of the apocalyptist, needs no demonstration. One goes too far¹ when the seven stars of Revelation i. 16 are taken as those of the small bear in view of a reference from a Mithras liturgy, according to which Mithras grasps with his right hand the golden shoulder of an ox, i. e. *ἡ ἄρκτος ἡ κινούσα καὶ ἀντιστρέφουσα τὸν οὐρανόν*.²

I will not mention all the analogies which exist between the Apocalypse and Babylonian mythological representations. With a single word allow me, however, to fix your attention upon Revelation xii., where in a most unique way the birth of the Messiah is described. It is represented there as a something that must take place, and hence in this form can-

¹ See H. Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 1903, p. 40.

² See A. Dieterich, *Elne Mithrasliturgie*, p. 14.

not be the work of a Christian, but must be the work of a Jew which was taken up by a Christian. The seer observes a woman, clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars. She was travailing in birth, when another sign appeared in the heavens, a great red dragon, which waited to devour the child as soon as it was born. After it was born the child was caught up to heaven, and a conflict ensues between Michael and his angels and the dragon, which ends in the defeat of the dragon. The origin of images must not be looked for with the Jews, but with the Babylonians. With the Jews the angels are taken to be men, but the heathen recognize also female divinities. From the insignia of the woman she is the queen of heaven, and involuntarily we call to mind the Babylonian Damkina, the mother of Marduk, or, according to others, the Egyptian Hathor, the mother of Horus. That a heavenly being who governs sun and moon can also suffer pain is a representation which can be understood only in a mythological way. The red dragon is the old king of the world sea, who has his abode in the abyss. Tiamat is his name, and he undertakes a conflict with the God of light. Thus the old myth of the victory of the young god of light over the evil powers of darkness became to the Christians a symbolic indication of Jesus' triumph over Satan and of the glorious ending of his life. Jesus became the God of light, the *Sol Justitiae*, and the woman the idealized Israel. I do not believe that the apocalyptist himself has known the origin of these images or symbols. Too much is wanting in the closer application of the same. But, be that as it may, we must in either case look for the origin thereof.

And now in our comparative investigation we come to the more contested points. In the first place, there is the supposed

agreement between the Buddhistic and Christian narratives, by which the dependence of the latter upon the former is asserted. These two religions have frequently been compared with each other, and—to name no others—a Schopenhauer did not hesitate to exalt Buddhism above Christianity. Both religions have points of agreement. They are universalistic, ethical, and so-called religions of salvation. But in this matter of redemption the difference is great. Buddhism proclaims salvation from suffering, i. e. from existence; Christianity brings salvation from sin. The subject in hand does not permit me to go further into this. The question is: In how far have influences of Buddhistic origin affected Christian narratives? It is self-evident that here the difference of the religious viewpoint makes itself felt. He who accepts that in the life of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels there are many legends and little history will be more inclined to look for parallel narratives from which to interpret sacred history, than he who, impelled by an exalted veneration of the person of Christ, accepts these Gospels as history rather than as products of poetic fancy. When one starts out from the position that Christianity is the outcome of a great syncretism, from which the Christ must be interpreted as a very common and natural product, one will sooner look for Buddhistic influences, than when Christianity is viewed as the work of the Christ—as I am convinced that it is—and full scope is allowed the person—I say not of the Founder of our religion—but of our Mediator and Lord, which the Christian church has done these nineteen centuries.

I state this in advance that I may correctly place before you the question which is here at stake, and that I may candidly confess that entire objectivity, or I had better say impartiality, is here impossible. Though I gladly add that they, also, who

stand upon my theological viewpoint take notice of the results of the study of the history of religions and reckon with it. Truth goes above everything else. No dogmatic proposition may take away from us the sharpness of our historical sight.

The attempt has been made to indicate parallels in the narratives of the births of Jesus and Buddha, and between the several Buddhistic narratives and that of Simeon in the temple, the twelve-year-old Jesus, Jesus' baptism, the temptation of the Lord, the call of the disciples, the Samaritan woman, the widow's mites, Peter's walk upon the sea, the parable of the lost son, the narrative of the man born blind, the transfiguration on the mount, etc. When these narratives are compared, as a rule the text of the Gospels and the texts of the Buddhistic narratives are placed side by side, and it is interesting to note that some strikingly similar points, upon a closer investigation, appear to be quite different. For instance, in Luke ii. we are told of Simeon that "he came by the Spirit into the temple." I would say, he was led by the Spirit of God, so that it was a Divine providence that the way of the infant Jesus and that of the devout Simeon crossed one another.¹ Of that wise Asita, however, who, according to the

¹ Dr. G. A. Van den Bergh van Eysinga (*Indische invloeden op oude christelyke verhalen*, 1901, bl. 29) interprets ἐν τῷ πνεύματι (Luke ii. 27) by: "in a magical manner," with a reference to 2 Kings ii. 16; Acts viii. 29; Rev. xvii. 3; *Hermas Visio* i. 1; ii. 1. R. Pischel (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1903, no. 48, sp. 2938, 2939) is not averse to this interpretation, and takes it for granted that ἐν τῷ πνεύματι originally rests upon the Buddhistic "Pfad des Windes." In connection with Luke ii. 25, 26, he observes that the absence or want of δὲ (Luke ii. 27) is very striking. For myself I believe that no one would have thought of a magical coming of Simeon into the temple, had not the above-mentioned parallel narrative of Asita been mentioned in connection with it. Simeon is not far distant from the temple, and does not appear there suddenly; but he is in Jerusalem, and betakes himself to the temple. Luke ii. 25, 26, teaches that the Holy

Buddhistic narrative, took his departure from the *Lalitawistara*, in order that he might welcome the new-born Buddha, we read in the particular parallel passage, that by magical powers he took his way through the heavens, or, according to the still later narrative of the same subject in the "*Buddhacarita*," that he was carried thither by the wind. Such comparison of particulars, however, is of little service to our purpose. Here one can at most but speak of an impression alongside of, or over against, impressions of others which would prove but of little interest. To enable you to pass an independent judgment upon the matter, I will pursue a different course.

I requested my friend Dr. Caland to select from the more frequently mentioned parallels one or two which, among the authorities upon the subject, are held to be conclusive, and which seem to be strikingly similar, and begged him to translate for me the text from the Sanscrit into the Dutch language. In consultation with me he chose, among others, the narrative of Simeon in the temple, to which I referred above, and compared therewith for me the visit of the wise Asita to the new-born Buddha as we find it recorded in the seventh chapter of the "*Lalitawistara*." To rehearse the story of Simeon in the temple in your hearing would almost be an insult. But let me point you to the Buddhistic narrative, which is mentioned in connection with it.¹ It reads as follows:—

Spirit was upon him, and that a divine communication was given him by the Holy Spirit. That which immediately follows, viz. he came by the Spirit into the temple, simply means that, led by the Spirit of God, he appeared in the temple. The absence of *ἀγῶ* detracts nothing from the significance of *πνεῦμα*.

¹ Vg. *Lalitawistara*, chap. 7 (p. 101, ed. Lifmann).

"At that time there lived in the neighborhood of the Himalayas a seer whose name was Asita, who had been instructed in the five (sciences), with Naradatta his sister's son. Immediately after the birth of the Bodhisattva he saw several wonders, curious signs and miracles. He saw sons of the gods go through the sky, and as they uttered the word 'Buddha' and waved their flowing robes, with great joy they moved hither and yon. The thought came to him: I will see what this means. Overlooking with his spiritual eyes the entire country of Dschamboedwipa, he saw in the beautiful city of Kapilawastu, at the house of King Coeddhodana, a new-born lad, all aglow with the splendor of a hundred good attributes, revered by all beings, the body being decorated with the two and thirty marks of the great man.

"Having seen this, he said to his disciple Naradatta: 'Know, my pupil, that in Dschamboedwipa a great jewel is originated. In the city Kapilawastu at the house of King Coeddhodana a lad is born, all glittering with the glory of the one hundred good attributes, revered by all beings, and equipped with the thirty-two marks of the great man. If he continues to dwell in the city he shall bear rule over a fourfold army and be a world-governing, triumphant prince: virtuous, a king of righteousness, in the possession of the power and might of his subjects,¹ and equipped with the seven jewels: the wheel, the elephant, the horse, the jewel, the woman, the major domus, and the commandant. In the possession of the seven jewels he will get a thousand heroic, vigorous, strong and army-destroying sons. He shall subject unto himself this great, ocean-bound earth without the means of punishment or use of arms, but simply by his own power, and by virtue of his upper-majesty he will establish a kingdom. When (on the other hand he goes) out from the city, and begins a roofless life, he will become a Tathagata, an Arhant, entirely illumined, a guide, who receives no guidance from another, a lawgiver, a light of this world. Now we will go to see this for ourselves.'

"Then the great seer Asita, with his sister's son Naradatta, went up like a flamingo, raising themselves above the air, and fled to the great city Kapilawastu, and, when arrived there, he suppressed his supernatural power, entered the city on foot, and betook himself to the house of King Coeddhodana. When this was reached he remained standing at the gate of the house of King Coeddhodana. There at the gate of King Coeddhodana the seer Asita saw several hundred thousands of people collected together. Now the seer Asita approached the keeper of the gate and thus addressed him: 'Go, my friend, and announce to King Coeddhodana that a seer is standing at his gate.' After the porter had said to the seer Asita, 'Good,' he went to King Coeddhodana, and, with hands reverently folded, thus

¹ The text here is not certain.

spake to King Coeddhodana: 'Know, Sire, that a reverend, aged, and long-lived seer stands at the gate, and says, that he desires to see the king.' Now King Coeddhodana commanded that a seat be placed in readiness for the seer Asita, and spake to the porter: 'Let the seer in.' Whereupon the porter left the royal palace and said to the seer, 'Come in.' Then the seer Asita approached the place where King Coeddhodana was, stood before him, and spake to the prince: 'Long live your Majesty! Reach an old age and protect thy kingdom after the laws of right and duty.'

"After King Coeddhodana had honored the seer Asita by offering him Arghya and water to wash his feet, and had given him a friendly welcome, he invited him to take a seat. Seeing that he was comfortably seated, he reverently and kindly (?) addressed him as follows: 'I do not remember that I have (ever) seen thee, O Seer! Why then have you come and what is your desire?' At these words the seer Asita spoke to King Coeddhodana: 'To thee a son is born, O Prince! And I have come to see him.' The King replied: 'The lad is asleep, O great seer. Wait a moment until he awakes.' The seer spoke: 'Such great men, O King, do not as a rule sleep a long time. Such worthies are active.' Out of sympathy with the seer Asita Bodhisattwa effected a cause to awake (the lad). Thereupon the king Coeddhodana, after carefully taking the lad Sarwarthasiddha in both arms, handed him over to the seer Asita. When Asita saw the Bodhisattwa, he expressed great joy: 'One of wonderful beauty indeed is here come into the world.' When with these words he had risen from his seat, and had folded his hands reverently, and cast himself at the feet of the Bodhisattwa, and, with turning the right side toward him (three times), had approached the place where he was, and had taken the Bodhisattwa on his lap, he was lost in deep thought.

"Seeing the two and thirty marks of the Bodhisattwa, Asita now surmised that the lad shall become either a mighty prince or a Buddha. Seeing him, he groaned, shed tears, and sighed deeply. When the king saw this, he asked with much concern, why the wise one wept. This one answered: 'I do not weep on account of the lad, O Prince! No evil shall come upon him, but I weep for myself.' 'And what for?' 'I am old and aged, and am at the end of life, and this lad Sarwarthasiddha shall undoubtedly obtain perfect enlightenment, and afterward shall cause the highest wheel of right to revolve. [Hereupon follow prophecies concerning the Bodhisattwa.] Because, however, it shall not be permitted us to see this Buddha jewel, I weep and sigh with great sadness of heart.' Then he foretells the king that the prince shall not abide in his house, because he bears upon himself the thirty-two chief marks and the eighty secondary marks which mark him as belonging to a something higher. After he enumerated these signs, he concluded with these words: 'In the possession of

these marks the lad will not dwell in a house; without doubt he will depart and become a hermit.'

"When King Coeddhodana had heard from the seer Asita these prophecies concerning the lad, he was pleasantly affected, excited, filled with joy, happy, and rejoiced. He rose from his seat, and, having cast himself at the feet of the Bodhisattwa, he spake these words: 'Blessed art thou of Indra and (all) the (other) gods, and by wise men art thou honored, thee the physician of the whole world. I also (praise and) honor, O Lord!' Then King Coeddhodana provided the seer Asita and his sister's son Naradatta food and clothing, and walked around them, turning to them his right side. After which the seer Asita departed by means of his magic power through the air and returned to his hermit hut."

How sober, simple, and true is the narrative of Simeon, how artificial and legendary that of the Buddha!

As regards the form and content, the difference between these two narratives is so great that he who attributes dependence to one upon the other has, as it seems to me, no conception of historical criticism. He who interprets the narrative of Simeon from that of Asita freely lays himself open to the charge of wilful refusal to take the narrative of the godly Simeon as history, and such wilfulness betokens a narrow viewpoint. And let no such dealings be accounted scientific. A motive such as this, viz., that an aged philosopher visits a new-born child on whom the world has set great hopes and gives it his blessing, is so common and natural that we have no need to look for an interpretation of the same. Bear in mind that the "*Lalitawistara*," in the edition known to us, dates from the second century after Christ. I grant that several parts which appear therein are much older, which older records may include the visit of Asita to the Bodhisattwa. The "*Boeddhacarita*," by Acwaghosha, however, which in the comparison is also referred to as a source, must have been written about two hundred years after Christ, and upon good authority the introductions to the *Dsjataka's* are

considerably younger. They are even placed as late as the fifth century after Christ. For any comparison with the New Testament, therefore, this literature can safely be passed by. The hypothesis presented by Seydel concerning a Buddhistic gospel, which also belonged to the sources of the synoptists, especially of St. Luke, is so precarious that in my "History of the Books of the New Covenant" I have not given it the honor of a mention. It is only from the third century after Christ that we have historic data of relation between Christianity and Buddhism, and after a twenty years' study of early Christianity I have discovered no traces of an unconscious influence of Buddhistical data.

A close relation, and even a mutual inworking, has also been asserted between the Mithras cult and the Christian religion, to which in the next place I call your attention. F. Cumont, a Belgian scholar, has lately pointed out the significance of the Mithras cult. This religion had so wide a spread in the early centuries after Christ, that it threatened to become a mighty opponent of Christianity. It is only when Christianity became a state religion, that the Mithras cult gradually lost its significance. I repeat that it lost its significance gradually, since for long times even Christians remained faithful to the service of Mithras and worshiped the *Sol invictus*, as Mithras was called. On the twenty-fifth of December the birth of Mithras was commemorated. In the course of the fourth century the commemoration of Christ's birth was changed from January 6 to December 25, probably with the intention of weakening thereby the Mithras cult, and of imparting a Christian tone to a pagan festival, such as has also been done with the festival of St. Nicholas.¹

[¹ In the Netherlands, St. Nicholas is celebrated on the fifth of December.—TR.]

Who was Mithras and where did his religion gain the largest following? With the Iranians he was originally the God of the heavenly light, who by the religious reformation of Zoroaster, even as the other Persian gods of nature in consequence of his (viz., Zoroaster's) dualism, was robbed somewhat of his majesty and glory. The people at large, however, remained devotedly attached to him. In the time of the Achæmenides, especially under Artaxerxes Mnemon (402-365 B. C.), the ancient god of light appears as the Lord of Hosts and obtains a general recognition. The Mithras religion coalesced with the Babylonian worship of the stars, and in this mixed form penetrated after the victory of Alexander the whole of Anterior Asia. Mithras appears by several names, such as Mithridates of Pontus, the enemy of the Romans. The Romans probably became acquainted with the Mithras cult in Cilicia, where, especially in Tarsus, Mithras was largely worshiped.

Almost simultaneously with the Jewish religion Mithraicism made its entrance in Rome in the year 63 B.C. From there it spread itself, by means of the soldiers, the slaves imported from the East, and merchants, over the then known world, Greece excepted. At first it found acceptance with the lowest classes, but later also with the higher, and even among the highest. Nero—as we shall see further presently—allowed himself to be worshiped by the Armenian King Tiridates as an emanation of Mithras, and with the Roman emperors the conviction gained ground more and more that their alliance with the divinity, from which they derived the image of the crown with radiations, would add great lustre to the emperorship. Commodus (180-192 A.D.) even allowed himself to be inducted into the mysteries of Mithras. In the third and fourth centuries the Roman emperors paid religious honors to

Mithras. This is even told of Constantine the Great, of whom coins have been preserved with the superscription *Soli Deo Invicto* or *Soli invicto Comiti*. Brief, however, was the glory period of Mithraicism under Julian the Apostate. Thereafter its pomp went down and came to naught. Enmity discovered itself with the Christians against the worshipers of Mithras, who were accused of being guilty of the persecution of the Christians under Diocletian. Manicheanism contains still traces of the ancient worship of Mithras.

In the time of the Roman emperors the Mithras cult was a sort of pantheism, which exhibited traces of influence from the Babylonian doctrine of the planets, and Greek philosophy, especially that of Stoa. Originally Mithras was not the principal god in Mithraicism, but Zrwan Akarana, the father of Ormuzd, and Ahriman, the highest, eternal, unknowable being, whose name is unutterable. The Greeks beheld in him the personification of time and eternity and of the infinity of the world. He holds the keys by which he opens the gates of heaven, through which the sun passes out and in, and through which also souls descend to earth and return to heaven. He is the heavenly doorkeeper, as Peter is in the Church of Rome. Mithras is also the mediator between the unknowable, highly exalted God and the living human race upon the earth. He is the Logos of the Christians. He protects the truth, the good, everything that is pure, and is the enemy of all falsehood and deceit, of Ahriman and his hellish domain. On the bank of a river—as it appears from the representations in bas-relief—under the shadow of a sacred tree, the divine child was born from a rock in a very wonderful way. Wherefore he is called The One Born from a Rock, or Petrogenes. Shepherds saw the wonder, worshiped the child, and offered him the firstlings of their flocks and of their harvest. Mithras soon

grew to be a healthy and an athletic lad. With a dexterous hand he cut the fruits of a fig-tree and clothed himself with its leaves. All this took place before there were any people in the earth, the shepherds of course excepted. And now Mithras engaged in the great conflict. He combats the sun god and conquers him, after which he enters into a covenant of friendship with the vanquished one, on whose head he places the crown with radiations, and from now on they mutually sustain one another.

The most important combat of Mithras is with the bull, the first living creature which Ormuzd has created. Mithras captures the animal, grasps it by the horns, and jumps upon his back. After the bull has escaped, Helios sends Mithras his raven with the demand that he shall kill the bull. However much it went against his wishes, Mithras offers the bull in the cave after he had recaptured it. A miracle took place. From the body of the dying animal sprang all sorts of herbs and plants. From his tail spring wheat and grains, from his blood a vine from which wine is prepared for the holy supper in the mysteries. In vain the evil spirit sends unclean animals, such as scorpions, gnats, and serpents, to poison the well of life. From the seed of the bull all useful animals appear. From his death originates life.

Meanwhile the first human pair had been created, whom Mithras protects against the attacks of Ahriman. Ahriman brings a drought upon the earth, but Mithras shoots an arrow against a rock, from which at once proceeds a stream of water. Ahriman wants to depopulate the earth by a flood, but by a divine command man built an ark, in which he saves himself with his family and his cattle. Ahriman destroys the world by fire, so that all habitable places burn up, but the creatures that were created by Ormuzd escape with the help of Mithras

also out of this danger. Mithras has now fulfilled his earthly calling. He has a last meal with Helios, at which bread and wine were used. Afterward with him he ascends to heaven in a chariot of the sun, in order henceforth to live with the other gods as an immortal, and from thence to protect the faithful.

That there are parallel passages between the religion of Mithras and Christianity is *lucē clarius*. Mithras reminds us of the significance of Christ as Mediator, in so far as he too is the Mediator between heaven and earth, God and man. With Mithras, also, the earthly career brings him difficulty and strife, but to humanity blessing and salvation. His life indicates a continuous struggle of the good against the evil. In the representation that Mithras was born from a stone, Firmicus Maternus (fourth century after Christ) sees an imitation of the representation that likens Christ to a cornerstone. Even as at the birth of Christ, so with Mithras' birth, shepherds appear, who kneel in adoration. The parallel is striking, but I take it to be accidental and see no dependence of Christendom upon the Mithras cult nor of the Mithras cult upon Christendom. The story of Matthew ii., that wise men came from the East, who, being star-gazers, had seen a star of peculiar lustre, which they connected with the birth of a man of significance, a divine light, has only recently been connected with the Mithras cult.¹ The Magi are taken to have been adherents of Mithras, whose priests preferred to be called Magi, and the star which they saw is supposed to refer to the same religion. But the latter inference is arbitrary, since in the East, even as in the antiquity in general, astrology was a well-known phenomenon. One of the factors which must be counted within the historic-genetic interpretation of this nar-

¹ A. Dieterich, *Zeitschrift für die neuest. Wiss.*, 1902, pp. 1-14.

rative is the incident, described by Dio Cassius (bk. lxxiii. chaps. 1-7), of the journey of Tiridates, who, with a great and glittering retinue, arrived in Rome 66 A.D. At Naples already he met Nero and worshiped him. But the acme of the festival is reached in Rome, when the people of all classes stood attired in white togas, decked with laurel leaves, surrounded by the soldiers most beautifully equipped with glittering arms. Nero appeared in the market-place in shining robes, attended by the senate and his body-guard, and Tiridates, with his retinue, approached him to offer him divine honors. He called himself his servant, and openly declared that he came to Nero, his god, to worship him, even as Mithras (*Σὸς δὲ δοῦλός εἰμι καὶ ἡλθόν τε πρὸς σε τὸν ἐμὸν θεὸν προσκυνήσων σε ὡς καὶ τὸν Μίθραν*).

Thus in Nero he beheld a reflection of Mithras. This narrative has made a deep impression upon the contemporaries. Pliny (H. N. xxx. 16) calls Tiridates a magiër and those who accompanied him magi. From the fact that the Magi of Matthew ii. 2 also say: "We are come to worship him," it is inferred that in the narrative of Matthew ii. the thought is expressed that Mithras would kneel before Christ. This is taken as a prophecy of the later disappearance of the Mithras cult before Christendom. This is indeed an original find, but historically not correct. If the narrative of Matthew ii. had originated in the fourth century, when the approaching decline of the Mithras cult was clearly perceived, I might readily give this view my consent, but in the latter decades of the first century, when, in all probability, the Gospel of Matthew was first known, no one had any idea of the passing away of Mithraicism. Then Mithras still shone in all his glory, and his cult obtained triumph upon triumph. There may be a similarity, but, on this account, I see no dependence in the idea that there

is a conflict between good and evil spirits in the religion of Mithras as well as with Paul. Christ, as Paul teaches in Colossians ii. 15, has by his death upon the cross spoiled principalities and powers, which are angelic hosts, and made a show of them openly, and triumphed over them. In Ephesians vi. 12 he writes: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places" against which we should arm ourselves with the whole armor of God. Mithraicism as well as Christianity views the life of believers as a conflict, and teaches that, if one would conquer in the fight, he must keep God's word and law. One must strive after sanctification, and perfect purity is the highest ideal, which is so strikingly stated in Matthew v. 48: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." This similarity, also, I do not interpret from any dependence of the one religion upon the other, but from the same need of the human soul, and from the conviction that the worshiper of Mithras as well as the Christian is created after the image of God. Repeated washings and purifications were the means by which to remove the stains of the soul.

This universal human symbolism is not only found in the Mithras religion and with Christianity, but among all other nations. It is the foundation of our Christian baptism. He who would be perfect must refrain from given foods, and apply himself to chastity. This asceticism was extant in the days of Paul and was assailed by him. It is noteworthy what merit the ethics of both religions attach to the moral of a deed, and how they warn against a sickly quietism and mysticism. It is noteworthy that the believer, according to Mithraicism, in the battle he has to fight can count upon the constant aid of

Mithras. Never is his help called in in vain. He is the sure haven, the anchor of salvation, and comes to the help of the weak in their temptation. This involuntarily reminds us of what is written in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 18) of Christ as the sympathizing High Priest: "For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." As helper Mithras is ever active and on his guard, and from every conflict he returns a victor. Therefore in Persian he bears the epithet *Nabarzēs*, even as in Greek and Latin the titles *ἀνικητος*, *invictus*, *insuperabilis*.

I will not trace the views of the followers of Mithras concerning the future state of the pious and the wicked in all particulars, because here the points of contact with Christianity are few. But I will say that both religions believe in an eternal life, in an eternal weal and an eternal woe, in the immortality of the soul, and in the resurrection of the body. The adherent of Mithras imagines that heaven is divided into seven parts, each sphere of which is apportioned to a planet. Judaism of a later day also accepted seven heavens, and also St. Paul, as we learn from 2 Corinthians xii. 2, where he speaks of a man in Christ, which was himself, who in an ecstatic state was lifted up into the third heaven. But I will not speak at length in this connection of the heavenly journey of the soul, which in its flight through the seven heavens leaves desires and passions behind on every planet, in order, freed from all imperfections and sensual lusts, as an exalted being to reach in the eternal light the eighth heaven and to enjoy an endless blessedness, because it has points of similarity elsewhere, but not in the New Testament.

Alongside of the moral power which went out from Mithraicism and the Christian faith, I also find a parallel in the way in which each emphasizes the faith in the omnipresence of

God. In Mithraicism, faith in the omnipresence of the gods is taken pantheistically, in Christianity the omnipresence of God is purely monotheistic. The Scripture says: "In him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts xvii. 28). The adherent of Mithras, on the other hand, declares that he beheld the influence and might of the gods in all the elements,—in fire, by means of which he prepares food; in water, by which he quenches his thirst and purifies himself; in the air which he inhales; and in the day in the light of which he walks. In both religions, man is constantly urged to pray and have fellowship with God. The Christian enters his inner room, closes the door, and prays to the Father, who seeth in secret. The worshiper of Mithras, if he be initiated, betakes himself to the sacred grotto, which is hidden in the loneliness of the forest. The stars that sparkle in the heavens, the wind that moves the leaves of the trees, the well or brook which murmurs in the dale, the very earth upon which the Mithras confessor places his foot,—all are divine in his eyes. They quicken in him a reverent fear for Him who is in everything.

The *μύστης*, or he who is to be introduced into the mysteries, went through seven grades, whereby he obtained the names of Raven (*corax*), Hidden (*κρύβιος*), Soldier (*miles*), Lion (*leo*), Persian (*Perses*), Runner with the sun (*Ἡλιοδρόμος*), and Father (*pater*). Originally these are indications that one identified himself with the divinity, which was represented in the form of animals. The point in question is, that the persons of the first three grades were called servants, were not yet admitted to the highest mysteries, and corresponded to the catechumen of the ancient Christian church. With the fourth grade one became a communicant. The members, who by divisions were in the care of a Frater,

were called *fratres* (brothers) or *consacramei*. At the head of the *patres* stood a *pater patratus*. At every grade to which one was admitted, one had to take an oath, called *sacramentum*, when one pledged secrecy of the doctrine and obedience to certain obligations. Thus there were seven sacraments, just as in the later Church of Rome. When one became a *miles*, or soldier, he was handed a crown on the point of a spear, which he pressed against his shoulder, with the promise that he would wear none other, since Mithras was his only crown (Tertullian, *De Corona*, 15). One had to subject himself to the several gruesome solemnities, chastisements, scourgings, fire- and water-ordeals, in order to attain unto a sort of stoical want of feeling or apathy. That which, however, reminds us again of the primitive Christian church is that the neophytes were prescribed different washings, a sort of baptism, or *lavacrum*, which was designed to purify believers from moral pollution. This baptism might be a sprinkling with consecrated water or an actual bath, just as in the cult of Isis.

Tertullian compares the confirmation of his fellow-believers to the ceremony whereby soldiers were given a sign in the forehead. This sign did not consist of an anointing, as with the Christian liturgy, but of a mark burnt in with a red-hot iron, similar to what was given the recruits in the army before they were admitted to take the oath. In the Mithras cult this is probably by way of imitation of the sign which Mithras gave to Helios when he entered into a covenant with him. At least it so appears from certain representations, where Mithras lays his hand upon the head of the god who is kneeling at his feet.

Some have observed that the strongest similarity between Mithraicism and Christianity consists in the consecrated meal

or holy communion. The *μύσθη* was given bread and a cup filled with water, over which the priest pronounced the sacred formula. Later on wine was added to the water. Even as, with Christians, only the baptized were admitted to the holy supper, so, with the initiated, only they who had reached the grade of teacher. This meal is portrayed for us in a noteworthy bas-relief.¹ The point of similarity with Christianity is also unique in this particular, that the holy supper reminds us of the meal which Mithras is supposed to have eaten with Helios before his ascension into heaven. Apart from the fact that it was a memorial meal, supernatural operations were expected from this mystical feast, more especially from the pleasures of the consecrated wine. This imparted physical and spiritual power, and fortified the individual in his combat with evil spirits. One even obtained thereby a blessed immortality, for in his letter to the Ephesians (xx. 2) Ignatius calls the bread of the holy supper the medicine of immortality and an antidote of death. Justin (Apol. i. 66) and Tertullian (De praesc. haer., 40) are greatly concerned on account of this similarity, which they take as a work of the devil, who in the Mithras cult caused imitations of Christian customs to originate, that Christians might be deceived.

I do not attach much significance to this similarity. I am willing to indicate the same, but the difference of feeling in mind and heart between the humble Christian who has celebrated the Lord's Supper and the follower of Mithras who has been initiated into the mysteries must have been very great. When his imagination had been highly wrought upon, and in semi-darkness he had been brought into a mystical mood, with the initiated of Apulejus he exclaimed (Metam. xi. 23 fin.): "I have passed through the gates of

¹ See F. Cumont, *Die Mysterien des Mithras*, 1903, Fig. 6, Tafel II.

death, and have crossed the threshold of Proserpina, and after having passed through all the elements, I returned to the earth. At midnight I have seen the sun send out his brilliant rays. I approached the gods of the lower-world and of the upper and I have worshiped them face to face." The Christian, on the other hand, who has received the symbols of bread and wine, who has been strengthened in his faith, and has tasted the joys of the *unio mystica*, expresses himself very differently. *Toto coelo distant*. I acknowledge the great similarity between the liturgy of the Mithras cult and that of the Roman Catholic Church as it developed itself in later times. The whole ceremonial was directed in either temple by a priest, who bore the title of *sacerdos* or *antistes*. The priesthood formed a sort of hierarchy with a *pontifex maximus* at the head, who was permitted to marry only once. Tertullian also relates that the adherents of the Persian god had their *virgines* even as the Christian, as well as *ascetes* or *continentes*. This latter is the more noteworthy because it does not harmonize with the spirit of Zoroaster to attribute any merit to celibacy.

Aside from the fact that the priest was in duty bound to keep the fire upon the altar, he was also to pray to the sun three times a day,—in the morning, at noon, and at dusk,—even as it was prescribed in the "Teachings of the Twelve Apostles," which is the oldest Christian liturgical writing or document of the first half of the second century, to pray the Our Father three times a day. Because both Mithras and Christ are each called the Mediator and the light of the world, it need not surprise us that the confusion became so great that Eusebius of Alexandria¹ communicates the fact that among Christians there were worshipers of the sun. This

¹ *Oratio περί αστραβήμης*, Ed. Thilo, 1834, p. 15.

habit of comparing Christ with the sun was attacked by Augustine, who maintained that the sun himself was not Christ, but had been created by Christ.¹ The coincidence of the birthdays of Mithras and Jesus on December 25 was interpreted at a later day, that Jesus was the true *invictus*, who had overcome death. As the adherents of Mithras indicated their joy over the birth of their god by the lighting of lights, so in Jerusalem at Epiphany, which was the original Christmas, a public religious service was held in the fourth century with lights.² I would take this as a matter of course, since to the human heart light is a symbol of gladness and of exultation. Both religions celebrate Sunday as the holy day of the week. In this also I see no imitation, as has here and there been asserted. First, because the observance of this day was fixed with the Christians at a very early date. In the New Testament we trace the unmistakable signs of the same. Moreover, the origin of this celebration is very different. Since Mithras was the god of light, the day of the sun was consecrated to him. Christ, on the other hand, died on Friday and on Sunday came forth from the tomb. From this springs the Christian memorial on the first day of the week.

These two religions can also be placed side by side in this particular, that in behalf of the propaganda they did not turn or devote themselves to the cultured and more refined strata of society, but to the humble and lowly. In their missionary labors they had such great success that the followers of Mithras as well as the Christians could adopt the word of Tertullian: "Hesterni sumus et vestra omnia implevimus." Judging from the number of monuments which have been left us by the Mithras cult, it may well be asked whether, in the

¹ Tract. xxxiv. 2.

² Vgl. H. Usener, *Religionsgesch. Untersuchungen*, 1889, I. 202.

days of the Severi, the followers of Mithras were not more numerous than the Christians. Considering the size of the caves or grottos in which they congregated, the most important of which, among those that have been preserved, is the Mithraeum of St. Clement of Rome, the local congregations can have been no larger than about one hundred persons. They formed a sort of moral bodies, and had something which makes us think of a consistory (*decuriones*), or *curatores*. They also had *defensores*, who pled the interests of the congregations at court, and *patroni*, who aided the congregations, which were kept in existence by voluntary contributions only, with financial support. And when I recall that the members called each other brothers, you readily understand that the comparison between Christianity and the Mithras cult has also a reason of existence in this particular.

Among the Parisian magic papyri, A. Dieterich has discovered a so-called Mithras liturgy, which he published in 1903 (*Eine Mithrasliturgie*, 1903). It represents itself as a revelation of Mithras, and must have been composed in a grotto. The initiated one purports to ascend through the seven symbolical gates of heaven, at each one of which he utters a prayer, until he arrives in heaven itself, where, in ecstatic vision, he beholds Deity. Noteworthy indeed in this connection is the mystical union of believers with the divinity, the being in it and remaining in the same, the *unio mystica*, and then the divine sonship. Between Mithras and Helios there is a relation of father and son, so that at one time Helios is represented as the only-born son of Mithras, and again, in divine union with him, is named the great god Helios-Mithras. Even as Helios is the first initiated one whom Mithras adopts into his fellowship, so is Mithras the father of his believers and initiated ones, or neophytes. This finds its analogy with

Christians in the relation of the Son to the Father and of the believers to God. In both religions we find the thought of regeneration, even as many symbolical forms occur with primitive peoples to which the same thought is fundamental. The old man dies and the new man takes his place. With the regeneration is allied the acquiring of a new name. The holy day on which the new birth takes place is called the *dies natalis* of the neophytes. This regeneration joins itself to the dying and rising again of a given divinity. With many peoples of antiquity a god is found who dies and rises again, who is descended into the realm of the dead and has ascended into heaven, as a path-breaker and exemplar of believers. Thus, for instance, at the spring festival of the Syrian god Attis, first of all his death was mournfully commemorated, and then on the third day his resurrection was joyfully proclaimed. In the mysteries of Mithras this idea of regeneration is symbolically indicated in the sacrifice of the steer. Those who were initiated called themselves "in aeternum renati." In the study of these things, however, we should be on our guard against the necessary exaggeration!

I read somewhere¹ that the central significance which the regeneration occupies in the New Testament with Paul and John is noteworthy in a more especial manner, because, with the Jews, yea with Semites in general, the image of death and regeneration is altogether wanting. I deem it possible to interpret the idea of regeneration of John iii. and of Paul from the Old Testament, without the aid of the Mithras religion. When, in his conversation with Nicodemus on regeneration, our Lord Jesus expressed surprise, that he, who was a teacher in Israel, did not know these things, he surely meant that Nicodemus should have been well versed in the Old Testa-

¹ W. Nestle, *Protestantenblatt* vom November 28, 1903, p. 385.
Vol. LXV. No. 257. 3

ment teachings, and not in the liturgies of Mithras or in the history of religions in general. That which was true and noble in the religion of Mithras was also found in primitive Christianity. But in saying so, I do not imply that Christianity has learned this from the teachings of Mithras. In the struggle with Christianity, Mithras has been worsted; and, according to the legend, after he had laid aside the Phrygian tiara, he became a pious warrior, was advanced to the rank of an officer, and later on became known by the name of St. George.

In recent times, influences have also supposedly been traced in the New Testament of the Egyptian so-called Hermetical literature, or that of Hermes, secret writings from the last century B.C. and the first century A.D., which contain all sorts of reflections, upon medical, astronomical, and theological questions, which Hermes communicates to those who have been more fully initiated, a sort of gnostic literature. The Hermes of the Greeks is here the Thot of the Egyptians. Even as the original Isis cult extended itself far beyond the boundaries of Egypt, the Egyptian philosophers or Greek priests adopted a definite Hellenistic philosophy. Thus there arose a pantheistic-mystic theology with proper cosmogonical representations. Among other things it appears, from the magic papyri that belong to it, that magical formulas were pronounced in the name of different gods, even in the names of Jahwe and Jesus. Thus it seems to me that the New Testament has been used in the preparation of the Hermes literature.

In either case so much at least is true that the Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel bears traces of similarity with the reflections upon the *λόγος θεοῦ* of Hermes. But there is also a difference. In the Hermes literature the *λόγος θεοῦ*

is called Poimandres,¹ the divine seed, which the *βουλή θεοῦ* embodies in itself as a visible world, or by which the *βουλή θεοῦ* becomes a visible world. That which in man hears and sees, is the *λόγος θεοῦ*. He is inseparably bound up with God, the *οὐς*. Their union is life, and the whole world is animated. Next to the *λόγος* and the *νοῦς* comes as a third the *βουλή θεοῦ*, which can be both *φύσις* and *γένεσις* only because God is himself the world. Conceptions such as Logos, life, light, fullness (*πλήρωμα*), the metaphors or figures of the good shepherd and the true vine occur in the named literature and with John. But I do not accept, such as is claimed for instance by Reitzenstein, the dependence of the New Testament. Does not Reitzenstein himself acknowledge, who by his two writings "Zwei religionsgeschichtlichen Fragen" (1901) and "Poimandres" (1904) proves himself a leading authority in this department, that probably these writings appeared in the first century after Christ? It seems to me that they should be placed later rather than earlier.

Thus the dependence of the New Testament upon other writings seems more and more improbable. I will not enter upon the consideration of further particulars; such as, for instance, that influence of the Hermes writings has been traced in Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus and with the Samaritan woman and in the well-known misunderstanding in the Fourth Gospel.² He who proves too much proves nothing. This last also applies to the assertion,³ that, in his prologue on the incarnation of the Word, John should have been dependent upon the representations of the Hindoos regarding

¹ See Ed. R. Reitzenstein, 1904, p. 45.

² Poimandres, ed. Reitzenstein, pp. 246, 247.

³ J. Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, 1902, p. 347.

the Awatares, that is the descent of the god Vishnoe. But I recognize the similarity in the point that the descent of Vishnoe also has a purely ethical and exalted purpose; to wit, to further the salvation of man by a redemption upon ethical ground.

The studies, however, of W. Heitmüller "Im Namen Jesu" (1903) and "Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus" (1903) have attracted the attention much more widely than the aforementioned observations. In the first he endeavors to show that in the New Testament, as well as in later Christian literature, a magical use was made of the name Jesus in baptism and in prayer, as though a moral power went out from the name as such; and he supports this by numerous parallelisms from the history of religions. In the second, Heitmüller limits his investigation, and, as the title clearly indicates, he confines himself to baptism and the Lord's Supper according to the Pauline conception of doctrine. Not Jesus, but Paul, must have fostered a magical understanding of baptism and holy communion. An unnatural emphasis is placed upon the thought, which, as it seems to me, is to be taken in a purely ethical sense, that in baptism we are brought into relation with the once dead and now risen Christ; and again upon the well-known passage 1 Corinthians xv. 29, where Paul speaks of those who were baptized for the dead, as though such baptism as *opus operatum* would benefit those who had died. Paul, however, does not adopt the superstition for himself, but places himself for the moment at the viewpoint of those who did. In view of a custom which is foreign to us and is not known beyond the apostolic age, he asks what this baptism signifies, if Christ be not raised. He attacks his opponents with their own weapons and appeals here to their superstition. Also, when in 1 Corinthians xi. 30, Paul refers to many cases of

sickness and death in the church in connection with the abuse that was made of the love feasts, whereby one ate and drank judgment unto himself, he indulges in no magical representation of the Lord's Supper. The apostle does not interpret these cases of sickness and death as results of meat and drink, but as a judgment of God upon the church on account of its sins. No, with Paul, we do not meet the thought, which we face so frequently in the history of religions, that by eating and drinking of bread and wine a union with divinity is originated, and that by the use of the flesh and blood of the sacrifice one becomes a partaker of divinity. With Paul, eating and drinking is only a symbol. It is not eating and drinking in the literal sense of the word. Neither is there any mention of a sacrifice in the Lord's Supper. The partakers of the holy communion may be *ἐν Χριστῷ*. But this is not the state of the *βακχεύοντες* of Dionysos, who were *ἐνθεοί*. I will not refer to all the parallels which Heitmüller cites regarding the Lord's Supper, but only these two.

The first one he cites is this: A peculiar custom of human sacrifices is told of the Azteken, a comparatively highly civilized tribe of Mexicans. Prisoners of war who were chosen victims for the sacrifice were given the name of divinities, wore their garments, were provided for a time with all sorts of attributes, and were given honors which ordinarily were offered only to the divinity, until on the great day of the feast they were slaughtered and consumed. Second parallel: Nilus narrates that, with a tribe of Bedouins on the peninsula of Sinai, there was a custom of sacrificing in vogue, which we have to view as the oldest form of animal sacrifices. By the light of the morning, accompanied by song, the tribe walked around a camel bound to an altar. With the last notes of the song the first wound was struck in the sacrificial animal. The blood

which streamed out from this was drunk, and the raw flesh, while still bloody, wholly eaten. Try what I may, I cannot understand how any one can place side by side such customs and the Lord's Supper. Have we here indeed, "die Vorstellungswelt des Herrenmahles in primitivster Form und deshalb in durchsichtigster gestalt"¹? Methinks that such an assertion does not indicate fine religious feeling and tact. When the history of religions can bring no greater service to theology than what we find here, the study of it cannot be very significant.

The result I reach is this: The influence of strange religions upon primitive Christianity is not very important. He who would interpret Christianity can do so by means of the Old Testament, the later Judaism, and Hellenistic philosophy. By doing this he walks the old and tried way. But, above all things else, let the full light be concentrated upon the person of Jesus Christ, who is the creator or rather the center of the religion that names itself after him. If history in general cannot be understood without the significance of those exalted personalities who gave the impulse to any great movement and who cannot be interpreted as mere products of their times, how much more does it apply to the sacred history of the origin of Christianity, in view of the person of Christ! To us he is the only-begotten Son of the Father, who has revealed the Father unto us. Give Christianity confidently a place by the side of other religions. Christianity contains whatever is noble and divine in them, and still a great deal more. Christianity recognizes the problem of sin, and proclaims the atonement of the sinner with God. Safely compare the Christ with Buddha or whomsoever you please. He raises

¹ Zoo W. Heltmüller, *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus*, 1903, p. 42.

himself above them all, even as, in the Jungfrauketen, the Jungfrau in all her virginal glory rises high above her surroundings. The *ὄψαν*, or seeing, of the Son of man, becomes a *θεωρεῖν*, a sight of admiration, and the *θεωρεῖν* ends in the *προσκύνησις*, i. e. in worship. *Sol Justitiæ, illustra nos!*

ARTICLE II.

BRUNETIÈRE AND THE NOVEL OF REAL LIFE.

BY THE REVEREND HENRY A. STIMSON, D.D., NEW YORK, N. Y.

THE group of modern French critics and essayists that began with Sainte Beuve and Taine, with Renan and Littré, as co-laborers, and continued with Scherer, Darmesteter, Hennequin, Doumic, and Rod, lost not the least influential of its members in the death of Ferdinand Brunetière.

It was in 1875 that his critical essay on "Le Roman Naturaliste" appeared. The drama had then given place to the novel as the accepted form of depicting the habits and taste of the times, and realism had already become its note. It claimed to break utterly with the past, and was successful, and defiant of established conditions. Accepting the lead of Balzac, Flaubert and the Goncourts set the pattern which had already led to the puerilities of Malot, the grossness of Zola, and the pretentious prettiness of Daudet. After thirty years, when the French novel has reached the unspeakable coarseness of Huysmans, and the American novel represents a society largely made up of gamblers, drunkards, seducers and seduced, and men mad in the pursuit of money, on the ground that this presents "life as it is," we are once more turning to the drama. The cycle is so far complete; and there is occasion to review the history of the period, and to measure the influence of a critic who did much to arrest the course of a pernicious movement and to expose its pretensions.¹

¹ The value of Brunetière's contribution both to literature and to

Brunetière connected realism in literature with positivism in philosophy, and ventured to express the fear that they would work, in both art and philosophy, a common degrading transformation. The futility of positivism, or materialism, in philosophy has been completely demonstrated, and it already belongs to the things of the past. A review of Brunetière's criticisms may help to hasten the departure to the same perdition of the novel of "realism." From his essays, scattered over a considerable period, and still untranslated, it is possible to gather and condense his opinions, and to give them substantially in his own words.

He pointed out what the new theories of Art as promulgated by the painters had already produced in literature. If it were only lack of talent and poverty of resource, the sterility of the times, which it was sought to conceal under an appearance of thought, one might wait with patience for better days. It was far worse than that,—it was low intent and a deliberate and foolish purpose to set aside the eternal principles of all true art. Taking Zola as his illustration, he said it is an art that sacrifices form to material, design to color, sentiment to sensation, the ideal to the real; which does not recoil either before indecency or pettiness, or indeed even before the brutish; which in fact talks to the mob, finding it easier to set art to serve the coarsest instincts of the rabble, than to try to raise their intelligence to the level of art.

The attempt to justify art of this kind, by the pretense of uniting it with science, and with the industrial life, the life of the common people, is futile. Commerce, and industry, and science, in proper hands, have already proved rich
morals in his early work is not affected by the subsequent narrowing of his mind and cramping of his powers by the change wrought in him during his service as editor of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*.

material, even for poetry, and need no new exploiting. When Zola announced his purpose, "in resolving the double question of temperament and environment, to follow the mathematical thread which leads from one man to another," he said: "Heredity has its laws no less than gravitation." Brunetière replied: "We know the law of gravitation, we can only guess at those of heredity,"—a warning it would be well to repeat to the author of "The Fighting Chance." Through all history, art and science have been in eternal and living contradiction; science subjecting the freedom of the human spirit to the yoke of nature's laws, and art, on the contrary, breaking away from the constraint of those laws and assuring to intelligence the full possession of itself.

The realists justified themselves by an appeal to Balzac. Brunetière pointed out that Balzac was the ancestor of the modern realists in his aim to cover all the diversities of modern life, in his accumulation of detail, his limitless description, his technical display; but that he dealt with reality only to transform it. He used his details as the artist does his model, as a means, never as an end. He gives to his characters a logical consistency, a development of passion, a course of conduct which, as traversed by the limitations of actual life, they would not have. His imitators have changed all that. Flaubert and Malot represent a realism content with the minute and puerile exactness of the smallest accidents of reality; Flaubert and the Goncourts, apparently proposing a study of a pathological case, cast in the form of a novel a medical clinic. Others like Daudet, without the poetic imagination and the inimitable accent of personal feeling of Dickens, practise a kind of sentimental realism by affecting an interest in the lot of the humble poor. Romance exists there, un-

questionably, but the realists are finding it difficult to deal with it nobly, and do not remember that there is a kind of low life so gross, or even so stupid, that it is not fit for the novelist to call attention to it, or for the reader to be amused by it.

When he comes to Zola, Brunetière finds it difficult to express his disgust at the absorption of that writer in the odious in his choice of subject, in the ignoble and repulsive in his depicting of character, in the materialism and the brutality of his style. He protests that humanity is not as yet made up altogether of loose women, of idiots and of fools. The artist certainly has his rights, but one of these rights is as certainly not to mutilate nature. It is strange that he should refuse to open his eyes to the light of day, and should not comprehend that this affectation of dealing with vulgar things is not a purpose less narrow, a convention less artificial, an æsthetic less false, than the pretensions to gentility of a day gone by. It is a diseased imagination that pretends to interest us in personages that are not only criminal and vicious, but frankly base, base as they are described, more base in the coarseness of the appetites which govern them. Even when there is a chance for a true idyl and a charming story there is the same low proclivity. Coarse sensuality is mingled with the love story, and in the picture the design is lost in the flaring colors. There is, perhaps, feeling, but it is feeling without soul. Everywhere the emotions are those of the animal. The characters, the author says, are "true to life" as is claimed. So is a drunken man who sleeps and vomits. Is there any more so? Will he give us that?

Reviewing some of the stories of Malot, it must be said at last, these are not real characters, they are caricatures. There exists no heart that has never leaped, no intelligence that has

never thought, no imagination that has never dreamed. As the human body, if it has not under our northern climate that purity of line which it had under the sky of Greece, but degraded by want, deformed by toil, bowed by modern civilization under the yoke of material customs, still preserves something of the nobility and the dignity native to the human form; so we, come as we are to the extreme of democratic equality, absorbed in the miserable exigencies of society life, incessantly driven in the pursuit of fortune and our personal ambitions, do not cease to have, within, something of the man, and to be still capable, by the passionate bound of the heart or by the strength of the mind, to lift ourselves above the reality which oppresses us.

In what, then, consists the pleasure which people of the grosser sort experience in looking at a vulgar melodrama, listening to the sound of coarse music, contemplating the assembling of vivid colors on the canvas, if it is not precisely in the momentary diversion they find from the weariness of existence and the hard labor of life? The cares of life are for the moment dismissed; and, free from all restraint, leaping all bounds, the intelligence is transported into a world which it fashions to its fancy. This protest against feeling and fact, this effort of the better side of our nature toward the ideal,—by what right does realism efface it from the list of our instincts, if not the right which it claims because of its own inability to satisfy and express it?

Without doubt it is necessary to go beyond reality, since the ideal is the essence of things, the raw material, so to speak, of works of art and of imagination. But if whoever affects to despise it in the novel or in poetry, then produces sentimental twaddle, or symbolical abstractions, it is, for all that, the substance to which it is the function of art to give a form.

.

It is not sufficient to feel ; one must see and one must think.

The power to seize in concrete form that which the average man sees only in the abstract is indeed a rare faculty, and one which characterizes the artist ; and yet it is still a small matter. Nature only becomes beautiful, or only becomes moving, when seen through the illusion of our feelings, which we transfer to her, an illusion which assigns to her this power of feeling, of which the human heart is the unique and never exhausted source. The glory of the sunrise, the serenity of a lovely evening, have only the value of the emotions they stir in us, now raising the heart to joy, to memory, to love, now as some implacable fate jeering at our despair.

But that is not all. From the midst of things prosaic and low in the scale of existence it is possible to detach what they conceal of hidden beauty ; it is necessary to eliminate, to select, to borrow from reality, its forms and ways of expression which may serve to transfigure that reality itself, and compel it to give forth the interior conception of a supreme beauty. In truth we are related to reality through the less noble parts of ourself, this necessity of daily work which reduces us to the plane of machines, or the appetites which unite us to the animals ; and all that is superior in us conspires to release us from the lot in which the bondage of material things holds us. In this sense, we may say, that "the world of art is truer than that of nature, and of history," because there one can see disappear the shocking contradiction, which inexorably passes judgment upon the human state, the contradiction between the grandeur of the goal toward which our aspirations push us, and the ridiculous weakness of the means we use to attain it.

If art busies itself solely with rendering the general truth of the type, it will produce, if you will, works of beauty, re-

fined, but cold and inanimate, which will be "like water, pure, and with no flavor"; as, for example, "The Martyrs" of Chateaubriand, "Eudore" and "Cymodocée." If it aims only to touch the heart, and to kindle the imagination, it will produce works of less value, from which, and the disturbance which they for the moment create, it will always be possible for the mind to deliver itself. Such are the novels of Richardson, "Clarissa Harlowe" or "Pamela"; such is "La Nouvelle Héloïse." If, finally, it judges that it has completed its task, when it has produced a servile copy of the real, one will admire the patience of the observer and the skill of the artist's hand, but as for the work itself, it will only completely succeed in giving us the grotesque.

Brunetière returned to the subject in 1880 on the death of Flaubert, in his essay on "Le Naturalisme Français"; again in 1881 in "Les Origines du Roman Naturaliste" and "Le Naturalisme Anglais," and in 1882 in "Le Faux Naturalisme."

In 1856, when Flaubert brought out "Madame Bovary," Romanticism was dead. The world no longer believed in "diplomatists, taking counsel with courtesans, in rich marriages obtained through intrigue, in the surpassing genius of jail-birds, in the availability of the gaming-table under the hand of the strong"; and sentiment had ceased to be supreme. Already authors had arisen who thought themselves justly sharers of the fame of Balzac. But the extravagances of Romanticism did not procure acceptance for the vulgarities offered in its stead. The world would none of a realism stripped of invention, of sentiment, even of passion and of reality. "What!" cried George Sand. "You would plane away all individuality? You say one should only paint in a single tone; you prescribe a vocabulary, and one departs from verity

if he does not strip from speech all the light and shade, all the color, that the genius and the passion of the human race have produced?"

Flaubert and his book set the pattern for the new movement. Brunetière recognizes the consummate literary skill, the abundance but strict subordination of descriptive detail, the unfailing and always just emphasis, the flow of description keeping pace with the flow of the narrative, like the change in the sky and in the landscape to one on a journey, the essential relation of the characters to their setting, and the fullness of knowledge which makes "*Madame Bovary*" as complete and accurate a picture of the life of a French province in 1850 as "*Middlemarch*" is of an English county in 1870. They have had many imitators, but Flaubert and George Eliot alike exhausted their subject.

Change the setting, and "*Madame Bovary*" will have to be changed. All the dullness, the commonplace, the vulgarity, the coarseness, is there. She is of it. And Flaubert is the first to make all this live, while keeping himself aloof from it and stamping it with his contempt. He preserved much that it would have been a pity to lose in the art of Romanticism, while he taught what is legitimate in Realism, namely, an intelligent understanding of the laws of representation and of life. The constant effort of the literature of the preceding twenty-five years to shape literary invention more strictly in accord with the living touch of reality, Brunetière declares, had its origin with him.

Brutal as the tale is, and disagreeable, Brunetière is willing to admit that it is not immoral, for this reason: admitting that in the deliberate purpose of the author, or by some fault of execution perhaps, the heroine awakens an interest of which she is wholly unworthy, it is nevertheless true that nowhere

will one find bitterer derision of all the extravagances of the Romanticists. Never was "the divine right of love," "the predestined union of two souls calling to one another across space," the "morality of passion," whether that which is of the earth earthy or that which is from above,—never before nor since, was all this, on the stage or in a novel,—attacked with an irony more contemptuous. As "Don Quixote" held up to ridicule the last exaggerations of the spirit of chivalry, so "Madame Bovary," in its day, ridiculed the last exaggerations of the Romantic delirium.

Compact of passion, vibrating with the force of sensations the significance of which she did not understand, eager to know the meaning of the words "happiness," "passion," "intoxication," which appeared to her so beautiful in books, Emma Bovary is a character possible in all lands and at any time. In her ignorance and with her sensual nature, she knows nothing of the charm or the satisfying poetry of a life of accepted duties. She finds herself listening to "the lyric song of bad women," and in the coarseness of her nature she adds to their number. She is true to type, and from a moral standpoint odious in her personality. The skill with which Flaubert makes her a creation which will live in literature does not conceal the sharpness of the irony and the bitterness of the satire which he turns upon the life to which she belongs, with a violence which seems almost the expression of a personal hatred.

What Brunetière finds lacking in Flaubert, and what constitutes the limitations of later novelists of his school, is the existence of another world, of those interior forces, intellectual and moral, which sustain the fight against the attack of the senses, and defeat the assaults of desire. They know nothing of that higher power in man, which can in a manner detach

itself from the body, can dominate it, and make it serve ends nobler than the gratification of the flesh. It is no wonder that, as the years passed, Flaubert hated to be known as the author of "*Madame Bovary*." We can imagine a similar experience awaiting not a few of the authors of modern realistic novels.

When one is content to see only the outside of life, he is inevitably superficial in his judgments, and as inevitably is affected by the limitations of his material. Flaubert dealt with characters whom he despised; he acquired a certain des̄pise for man; he came to see little good anywhere; and the bourgeois life which he held up to ridicule had its revenge when it inspired him to write "*L'Education Sentimentale*."

The skill which seeks to justify itself in the sounding phrases "art for art's sake," "the love of literature for itself," "the religion of the ideal," and the like, is less the power to see "life as it is" than mere dexterity at the trade. The final judgment must be, the ideal remains low, the cult is material, the literature falls into coarseness, and all because the form is made to serve the end rather than the means. As a consequence the day comes when artifice is more important than feeling, when inspiration is summoned rather than felt, when, in a word, what one has been taught, or what one has gathered, is more important than what one possesses as his *gift*, so-called, because it is the one thing which cannot be given and cannot be received.

In his essay on "*Les Origines du Roman Naturaliste*," Brunetière took in hand Zola, then at the height of his success. He had published a book of essays devoted to the study of Balzac, Flaubert, and Stendhal, as the creators of the novel of actual life, of which he himself was the latest exponent.

Brunetière with difficulty restrains his disgust at the ignorance, the pettiness, the superficiality, and the conceit of the school. He points out, first of all, that, passing by the writers of historical romance, like Walter Scott, who had done the same thing, the whole great school of Romanticists, from Richardson and Rousseau to Chateaubriand, George Sand, and Mérimé, had not only broken away from the bondage of the classical school, by making the novel revolve about the character and experiences of a single personage, but had set that personage in surroundings most real and carefully studied. The realistic novel actually began with "Clarissa Harlowe" and "La Nouvelle Héloïse." Not a single novelist since their day but has claimed to restore to truth, nature, and reality their rights, which had been circumscribed by arbitrary conventions. Rousseau in "La Nouvelle Héloïse" was the first modern writer to treat love seriously. Before him, when love, or more generally the relations of the sexes, was dealt with in literature, it was in one of two ways,—in the Italian manner, that is to say, gallant, as in the novels of Mlle. de Scudéry; or libertine, that is to say French, as, for instance, "Le Diable Boiteux." "Gil Blas" and "Manon Lescaut" are the only exceptions. In "La Nouvelle Héloïse," for the first time Love becomes the hero of the story. There, also for the first time, the personages of the drama are placed in dependence upon what we have since learned to call their *milieu*; and there, also for the first time, we find a novelist giving to the public the story of his own life,—so much at least as is found in the scenes in which he has lived, the personages he has known, and the experiences through which he has passed. The world of "La Nouvelle Héloïse" is incontestably larger than that of some of its successors. The actors in it move more freely; they appear in relations more numerous, more

varied, more complex; they are more closely bound up in what goes on about them; but the new method is established.

George Sand carried it still further. Before her, the characters of the story are enclosed in the circle of the family; she set them in perpetual relation to the prejudices, that is to say to the social life, which surrounded them, and to the law, that is to say to the state. After her, other writers deal with the rich in contact with the poor, the employer with the employee, the people with the peasant. Whether their stories are to-day interesting or not, whether their theses are false or not,—and they are sometimes all the more evil because eloquently set forth,—they indicate the movement.

When it comes to the men whom Zola exalts, they seem to have lost both the meaning and the method of the true romance. They are superficial, they are narrow in vision, they are conquered by trivialities of detail, they are fascinated by the brilliancy of their own style. They create scenes which they hang up as pictures, and they have lost the art of composition.

Balzac, of course, stands alone. His distinction is that he introduces into the novel the preoccupations of the material side of life. One must live; to live, one must eat; to eat, one must have money; to get money, one must work; to have work, one must learn a trade, that is, a man must belong to a particular profession, or condition, or class. So he introduced these differences into the novel, each character determined by those peculiar to his class, appearing in the conversations, declaring themselves even in the nature of the intrigue. You have not only the jargon of the atelier, the barbarisms of the workshop, the slang of the street, and the billingsgate of the market, but you have for the first time the question of money, and with it all that the pursuit and keeping

of money bring in its train. With all this Balzac did not create the novel of real life. He simply wrote "Balzac's novels." That surely, as Brunetière says, is sufficient.

As for the others, Stendhal has no following; the Goncourts, laborious and self-conscious artisans of style, depart from nature just in proportion as they apply to the coarsest subjects the methods of an overwrought and unnatural art; and Zola, who fancies that he and his school are the supreme product of an evolution, is in fact but an incident in its course. The realistic novel has had its day; idealism is not dead; and the current degradation of the public taste, which does not need many "Nanas" to carry it to the bottom, will never be corrected by anything produced by that school.

When Brunetière comes to discuss English novels, he points out that realism in literature would, apart from the work of the great English authors, never have been more than a theory; any more than realism in painting would have gone beyond theory but for the art of Holland. Zola and his friends are utterly ignorant of the profound psychology which pervades the great English novels, as they are devoid of the real and intelligent sympathy with the humble life they despise, which characterizes, for example, Dickens and George Eliot. From "Tom Jones" and "Amelia" to "Adam Bede" and "The Mill on the Floss" you find a series of stories distinguished by sympathetic intelligence, where in the French tales you have disdain and contempt. Flaubert knows how to construct life out of the commonplace and the vulgar. George Eliot did better; into the commonplace and the vulgar she wrought the noble. What the French realists do not understand is, that there is another measure for the worth of men than their education, or even their intelligence; and that the nature of the attraction which women exert is not that solely

over the senses, or even that of beauty alone. Herein lie, on the contrary, the dignity, the depth, the real beauty, of the English realism. It is to be said of the Richardsons, the Fieldings, the Dickenses, the George Eliots, that they love their characters because they so thoroughly understand them. If for one moment we suspected irony in their delineations the charm would be gone.

Balzac is extraordinarily powerful, but he is gross. Despite the laborious and conscientious effort he makes to lay hold of them, delicate niceties escape him, as they do Flaubert, because of the lack of that sympathy which is necessary for their understanding. Both have heard of them, but they do not know them. They are skillful physiologists and imperfect psychologists; exact observers and clumsy analyzers; vigorous painters of palpable reality but mediocre explorers in the realm of that reality which lies beyond the sight. Personality only begins when you trace sensation within. It has been well said that sensations are only what the heart makes them. Exterior action is little, interior reaction is what counts. It is the diversity of these interior transformations that makes us the men we are.

Here is the triumph of the English realists. The author of "Clarissa Harlowe" and of "Pamela" was the first to set in the frame of the novel of actual life all the wealth of psychologic and moral observation in the grand preachers of the seventeenth century, and, for instance, in the Bourdaloue of the eighteenth century, whom England knew better than his own country. This triumph of psychologic study reaches its most complete and brilliant example in the work of George Eliot. You are lifted entirely out of the realm of chance. You see not only that the consequences of a single transgression may lead to actual crime, but also, how they do it, by just

what conjunction of circumstances, and by what line of interior perversion. You see, also, the vast importance, for the good or evil of a human being, an act in itself insignificant may prove to possess. Our actions react upon us. We have the power to start their course; the rest follows of itself. Circumstances do not alter our nature, they only reveal it. Events create nothing in us, they show what we carry about within. Every life depends on the direction it gives itself, upon the restraint it places upon itself.

Here is the main difference which, at that point in their development, characterizes English and French realism. The depth of its psychology, its metaphysical solidity, the breadth of its ethics, all in the English realism flow from its expression of sympathy. Three centuries of vigorous Protestant education have infused something of positive moral value into English realism. In France, on the other hand, the novel may serve for an instrument of propagandism, or a machine to batter old and uncomfortable institutions and customs, but it will probably never serve, as with Dickens, Thackeray, and George Eliot, as an instrument of exhortation, of study, of instruction. In France art is not thought of as existing for man, but man is conceived of as material provided by nature for art. "Art for art's sake" is essentially Latin.

The difference in the two schools, working with conditions which are fixed and with materials at their command, is illustrated in the way in which the French would paint the portrait of a coquette like Hetty Sorrel, who from slip to slip was at last guilty of infanticide. They would not give to her, as George Eliot did, "a kind of beauty, like that of kittens, or of very young ducklings, with their soft down, uttering their pretty chatter, or of little children, beginning to

walk, or playing their first pranks." They would describe a beauty heavy, vulgar, sensual, if they thought themselves realists; a beauty fatal, inevitable, breathing crime, if they were idealists, in either case a beauty which prepares the imagination for the crime which is to come.

The final question, in an examination of realism in England compared with that of France, is, Is it possible in the novel to join the classic excellence of composition, of balance of parts, of distribution of masses, of beauty of arrangement, to that minuteness of detail which is necessary, if the ordinary and the commonplace is to be made to have life? The excellence of composition, of general form, setting apart that remarkable tale "*Jane Eyre*," is apparently lacking in contemporary English realism; on the other hand, in the French realism in general, and excepting one or two instances, we miss that power of sympathy which gives life to the English novel, to the carpenters and the weavers of George Eliot, as has been pointed out. The traits seem to exclude each other. Will any author arise, able to unite them? This is the problem in æsthetics which remains to be solved by the novelist of the future.

The outcome of it all is that the realism which in France thirty years ago held the field, and exerted such extensive and powerful influence in both this country and England, as well as in France, Brunetière denounced as masquerading under a name which it did not deserve. The matter and the manner of the Goncourts, of Zola, and their imitators were not true to nature. On the one hand they are "stylists," using words for their own sake and apart from the idea which they serve to convey, sacrificing truth to brilliancy, to picturesque effort; on the other hand, superficial in thought, and shallow and mean in occupation. Nothing is more worn out,

nothing more untrue to life, for example, than Goncourt's idea that inspiration for action is to be found in the libertinism of the senses and the debauchery of the spirit.

The school had reached its limit of extravagance in "La Faustin" and "L'Assommoir." Brunetière sought to give it a *coup de grace*. It ceased to produce further single, brilliant specimens, but it was already spread like a disease, and there has followed in England, as in France, a crowd of more or less close imitators. They have gradually run their course. We are waiting now for the Walter Scott or the George Eliot, the George Sand or the Balzac, of a new day. Meanwhile, the dramatists once more have the field, and that realism that survives in them is compact of an intense idealism that moves often in the realm of psychological mystery. We have Ibsen, and Suderman, and Maeterlinck, and Hervieu, and Capus, and Mendès, and Stephen Phillips, and Bernard Shaw. The swing of the pendulum is slow and the evolution often lags; a new Brunetière dealing with these workers may arise to help us into a more permanent realm of light.

ARTICLE III.

SCIENCE AND HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY HONORABLE F. J. LAMB, MADISON, WIS.

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good" (1 Thess. v. 21).

THIS maxim of Religion is also fundamental in Science. It expresses briefly the essential spirit of what is recognized as the "scientific method" of investigation; the method which, rightly employed, has in our age vastly advanced man's dominion and knowledge in every department of human welfare.

HIGHER CRITICISM TO-DAY.

Higher criticism of the Bible must be judged by the effects it has already produced, and the certain consequences that must follow, the realization of the claims which its votaries insist that it has conclusively accomplished. These are set forth in Dr. Orr's recent book,¹ a work which lays the religious world, all honest inquirers after truth, under profound obligation. He tells us it is the result of study of Higher Criticism in all its schools and phases for thirty years; and "the conclusions of the critics force themselves on every one's attention, and it is a matter no longer of choice, but necessity, to pay regard to their opinions" (p. xiv).

The matters in contention between these destructive critics and Christian believers, as he states them, directly or indirectly, are:—

1. The whole question of the value of the Bible as an

¹The Problem of the Old Testament, with Reference to Recent Criticism. By James Orr, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906.

inspired and authoritative record of God's historical revelation to mankind. Has God spoken, and does the Bible convey to mankind his sure word for our guidance? Have the Scriptures of the Old Testament any longer the value for us they had for Christ and his disciples? (p. 6).

Or, as these destructive critics contend, must we concede that, as the result of the critical discussions of the past century, historical foundations of the Old Testament revelation have been subverted; that neither the Pentateuch nor any part of it was written until several hundred years subsequent to the death of Moses? Must miracle and the supernatural be eliminated from the Scriptures? Must *man's changing and erring thoughts about God* henceforth take the place of God's words to man? Are the erstwhile "lively oracles" of God simply the fragmentary remains of a literature to which no special quality of divineness attaches, and is the supposed history of salvation a piecing together of the myths, legends, and free inventions, of an ignorant age? Dr. Orr's review of the cult (in the 539 pages of his book) shows that the extensive body of higher critics now in the ascendant, who arrogate to themselves the title "modern," answer the questions last above with an unhesitating "Yes." The mass of believing Christians answer such challenge with an emphatic "No."

2. He states the effects this destructive criticism has produced upon many who perhaps, as he says, "have given too easy an assent to current theories simply because they are the theories of the hour," which he describes thus:—

"There is no gainsaying the fact that, historically, it was in rationalistic workshops mainly, that the critical theory was elaborated, and that, from this circumstance, a certain rationalistic impress was stamped upon it from the first. . . . Most of all is it true of the type of theory which is at present the dominant one,—the theory which,

to indicate the line of its origin, we might describe as the Vatke-Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen one,—that it is rationalistic in its basis, and every fibre of its construction. Yet it is this theory which, chiefly through the brilliant advocacy of Wellhausen, has for the time won an all but universal recognition in critical circles on the Continent and in English-speaking countries. Its arguments are adopted, its conclusions endorsed, its watchwords repeated with almost monotonous fidelity of iteration by a majority of scholars of all classes,—in churches and out of churches, High Church, Broad Church and Low Church, sceptical and believing" (p. 17).

Here, then, we have the conditions and controversy to which higher criticism of the Bible has brought not only the religion of Israel, but Christianity itself also, at the present time. It is obvious that, if these claims of the "modern" or destructive critics of the Bible are established, and carried out to their logical and inevitable consequences, they must, as Dr. Orr says, "prove subversive of our Christian faith and of such belief in, and use of, the Bible as alone can meet the needs of the living Church" (p. xv). He adds, "If these theories are to be dealt with satisfactorily, it can only be by going at first hand to the sources, tapping the stream, as it were, at the fountain head" (p. xvi).

One, and apparently the most, prolific cause of the destructive theories of these critics is the alleged parallel pre-Pentateuchal narratives which the critics contend are the sources of, and which by being bodily combined have produced, the first five books of the Bible. We propose in this article to apply the scientific method of research in examining these alleged sources of the Pentateuch, and, in that immediate connection, the sources of the destructive theories of these critics.

We do not find that such higher criticism of the Bible has ever been tested as to its verity by the ordeal of actual trial, as required by the maxim "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." We know the claims and contentions of

such critics have been met by learned and able arguments; but have they ever been subjected to the exacting demand and ordeal of the scientific method and Bible maxim which relentlessly require proof, and counsel holding nothing as "good" or verity on mere argument or debate? Ascertaining and establishing truth or fact from evidence constitutes "proof." Securing proof from evidence is the distinctive function of the science of jurisprudence. The rules, tests, standards, and methods of jurisprudence, in dealing with evidence, are the axioms which the experience and sagacity of ages have established as the best means of discriminating truth from error.¹ They may be described as the machinery of juridical science by which it attains and establishes results. Thereby the Science of Jurisprudence takes a disputed question out from the indeterminate sphere of argument or debate, and, carrying it forward, advances it to issue, test, and the ordeal of trial. The result of trial establishes, from evidence, verity as to the matter in contention. This is what is seen constantly in litigation in courts of justice, where the result is formally announced and enforced.

But this function of juridical science is not limited to compulsory litigation in courts of justice. It is available for trying and deciding any and all contentions between disputants when truth or fact is to be ascertained and established through evidence. This may be illustrated by the use made of juridical science by Abraham Lincoln in his oration at Cooper Institute in 1860. In the heat of political strife over slavery, the South, appealing to Washington's warnings against local prejudice, charged the dominant political party of the North with sectionalism. Mr. Lincoln in public discourse employed this machinery of juridical science to test and try that charge.

¹ A. P. Will, *Evidence*, p. 1.

Identifying himself with that party at the North, and addressing the South, Mr. Lincoln said:—

“You say we are sectional. We deny it. That makes an issue; and the burden of proof is on you. You produce your proof; and what is it? Why, that our party has no existence in your section, gets no votes in your section. The fact is substantially true, but does it prove the issue? If it does, then in case we should, without change of principle, begin to get votes in your section, we should thereby cease to be sectional. You cannot escape this conclusion; and yet are you willing to abide by it? If you are, you will probably soon find we have ceased to be sectional, for we shall get votes in your section this very year. You will then begin to discover, as the truth plainly is, that your evidence does not touch the issue.”

Mr. Lincoln by the use of the machinery of juridical science brought forward what was before befogged in debate to issue, trial, and decision as conclusively and certainly to the public, those who were affected by it and who in fact constituted the tribunal, as though the judgment had been announced by a court in session.

The “issue” is of supreme importance in the machinery of jurisprudence. It consists of the exact point in dispute between contestants, stated as a proposition, affirmed by one party, denied by opponent.¹ The “issue” thus enables each contestant to produce his evidence, to make “proof” of his contention. On the evidence, or failure of evidence, juridical science determines the controversy. If a party to the “issue” cannot produce evidence to prove what he affirms, judicial science determines the affirmation untrue. The affirmation is set aside, held for naught, as was illustrated by Mr. Lincoln’s use of the “issue” in the case just stated. By employing the method and machinery of juridical science, we shall (as at present advised) approach the examination of destructive higher criticism of the Bible from a new basis, by a method not heretofore used. It is a basis and means, how-

¹ Gould’s Pleading, 279.

ever, which the maxim and science expressly call for, that which, from evidence, evolves "proof," and thereby determines controversy.

The simple questions we propose to examine are: Has the cult of destructive higher criticism of the Bible ever complied with, or can it now comply with, the requirement of the maxim; viz., make "proof" of its alleged foundation and the claims which its advocates insist it has established on that alleged foundation?

We propose to bring these questions to the ordeal of issue and trial. For such ordeal, in such case, juridical science requires the selection, for "the issue," of a question that underlies the controversy—on which other and subordinate matters hinge.¹ This feature of higher criticism of the Bible, initiated by Astruc (A.D. 1753) and formulated by these critics, asserts that before the Pentateuch or any part of it was written, one called Elohist (or E) had composed a narrative of the matters in the Pentateuch, in which E habitually and constantly employed the divine name Elohim to designate God, and one called Jehovist (or J) had also composed a parallel narrative of the matters in the Pentateuch, in which J habitually and constantly employed the divine name Jehovah to designate God; that the alleged E and J narratives as sources were embodied from alternate sections of each narrative in producing the Pentateuch; that the alleged alternation of those divine names Elohim and Jehovah in the Pentateuch is the result of so embodying alternate sections of those two alleged parallel narratives in it; that, by sundering the Pentateuch on the criteria or test of the names Elohim and Jehovah, they now manufacture an E narrative and a J narrative, between which narratives so manufactured they claim there are discrepancies,

¹ Greenleaf, *Evidence*, sec. 3.

contradictions, and variances, from studying which these critics evolve and deduce the destructive conclusions with which they attack the Bible. Such preëxistence of the alleged E and J narratives, i. e. before the Pentateuch was written, seems to furnish a controlling point of dispute between higher critics and Christian believers for the "issue" here.¹

Dr. Green says of this point of dispute:—

"The alternation of the divine names *Elohim* and *Jehovah* is made by them [these critics] the key of their whole position. This is the starting-point of the partition, and of the entire hypothesis of the separate documents. All the other criteria are supplementary to this; they are worked out on this basis, and find in it whatever justification and proof of their validity they have. All hinges ultimately, therefore, on the exact transmission of these fundamental and determining words. . . . If there is anything that must be absolutely fixed and resolutely adhered to, if the document hypothesis is to stand, it is the accuracy of these divine names which are the pillars on which the whole critical structure rests."²

Divesting the dispute between the destructive higher critics and believing Christians of all other contentions and reducing controversy to the simplest single question that underlies the dispute, we may make the alleged existence of the said E and J narratives before the Pentateuch was written the "issue" between those parties on which other disputed questions hinge.

ISSUE PROPOSED.

The "issue" then may be thus stated: Higher critics of

¹Critics postulate additional entities as participating in composing narratives alleged to have been embodied in the Pentateuch, as second Elohist (B), priestly writer (P), Deuteronomist (D), etc. (see William H. Green, *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, p. 88; Orr, *Prob. of the Old Test.*, pp. 202-206). But, as examining such additional alleged sources of the Pentateuch would be only duplicating examination of the alleged E and J sources, brevity and simplicity lead us to limit the examination, as we do, to those two (see Orr, *op. cit.*, p. 65).

²*Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, p. 90.

the Bible allege that the said supposed E and J parallel narratives existed before the Pentateuch was written. This allegation we deny. That makes an issue. It is an issue of fact. Such issue is to be determined by evidence. The explicit question is, Is it a fact that the alleged E and J narratives existed before the Pentateuch was written? The affirmative and burden of proving that allegation of fact to be true by competent relevant evidence rests upon these higher critics. If they cannot prove those allegations true, by valid evidence, juridical science shows they fail and that that alleged fact, and all their claims built upon it, must be held false,—be set aside and held for naught, like the baseless fabric of any dream. This is what juridical science accomplishes. This is its function. It provides the “issue,” and so furnishes rational and just opportunity to each party to present his evidence to sustain his contention in the dispute. When the production of what is offered as evidence is concluded or the failure of evidence is disclosed, juridical science pronounces the result, which is judgment against the affirmant, if he cannot produce evidence to prove his allegations true.

CRITICS' PROPOSED EVIDENCE EXAMINED.

What evidence do the higher critics produce to prove that the alleged E and J narratives existed before the Pentateuch was written or existed? None. What these critics propose as evidence to prove their affirmations true is found in their abundant publications. They do not even pretend to produce any direct or positive evidence to maintain that allegation. What Dr. Orr says of the alleged entities E and J is true of the alleged narratives of E and J: “Neither history nor tradition knows anything of them.” One will be surprised to find how Dr. Orr repeatedly convicts the destructive higher

critics of resorting to the *petitio principii*, to maintain their unfounded claims.

We are here dealing with what these critics aver are the sources of the Pentateuch. One of those critics, Westphal, is quoted by Dr. Orr as author of a work entitled "*Sources du Pent.*" in which that critic seems to have inventoried alleged certain achievements of this higher criticism of the Bible. After enumerating (1) four sources of the Pentateuch narratives,—by Elohist, second Elohist, Jehovist, and Deuteronomist,—he names (2) "*the admission of the fact that each of these sources before its entrance into our Biblical books, existed as an independent writing.*"¹

This claim of the critic that the verity of the alleged pre-existence of the alleged E and J narratives was proved by admission, betrays a lamentable ignorance of judicial science, of what evidence is, of what verity is. Verity of alleged facts is not established by admission. A party who makes an admission as to an alleged fact may be forced to receive the consequences of the admission as though it were a verity. But such admission is absolutely powerless in proving the alleged fact an actuality. Galileo had asserted that the sun was central in our system and that the earth moved around it. Under the pressure of ecclesiastical tyranny, Galileo, with great solemnity, admitted as fact that the earth stood still—did not move—and that the sun revolved around the earth. But that admission did not make or prove it true. The admission was utterly futile for proving that the earth stood still as an actuality. Neither did nor can any admission by any man or body of men, at any time or any place, that the alleged E and J narratives existed in fact before the Pentateuch was written, prove that in fact they so existed or that the allegation is true.

¹ Prob. of the Old Test., p. 208; *Sources du Pent.*, vol. II. p. xxvi.
Vol. LXV. No. 257. 5

We do not overlook nor forget that these critics insist that they do produce matter as evidence to maintain the contention at issue on their part. And what is it? Stating it in the form of propositions that can be dealt with, tested, and tried ¹by juridical standards, it may be thus ¹ designated:—

No. 1. That sundering out from the Pentateuch consecutively the sections or parts in which the divine name Elohim occurs will produce an intelligent, consistent, and accurate narrative of the matter of the Pentateuch without breaks or chasms, and a like parallel narrative of the matter of the Pentateuch will be produced by sundering out of the Pentateuch successively the sections or parts in which the divine name Jehovah occurs; that the two narratives, so manufactured by the critics, verily constitute the alleged E and J narratives.

No. 2. That, as a result of No. 1, these critics insist they show that the Pentateuch must have been produced by simply embodying therein, in alternate sections, the alleged E and J narratives.

No. 3. That the alternate occurrence of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah in the Pentateuch was caused, and is explained, by the embodiment therein of the alleged E and J narratives in the manner alleged in their propositions No. 1 and No. 2.

It must be remembered that we are trying issues of fact, which can be tried by evidence only. But these propositions No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3 are not evidence, nor is either of them evidence. They are mere theories, mere unproved hypotheses. Juridical science utterly rejects theories and unproved hypotheses as evidence. But these critics bring the matter of

¹ Green, *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, pp. 89, 109, 118.

these three propositions forward, to maintain the issue on their part, and we will give the propositions juridical consideration. These three claims fall at once under the maxim "Prove all things; hold fast" only those which are made good by "proof."

We deny these alleged propositions Nos. 1, 2, and 3. We deny that sundering out consecutively from the Pentateuch the sections in which the name Elohim occurs will produce a consistent, intelligent, accurate narrative of the matter of the Pentateuch, without breaks or chasms, and deny the like allegations as to so sundering out from the Pentateuch the sections in which the name Jehovah occurs.

We assert that even if such alleged Elohist and Jehovist narratives could be thus manufactured by such partitioning of the Pentateuch, it would not prove that such two narratives so manufactured were the alleged E and J narratives, or that they were the source of the Pentateuch or of any book of the Bible.

We further deny that the proposition or hypothesis No. 3 of the critics can be allowed as evidence to explain the alleged phenomenal alternation of the divine names in the Pentateuch, for the reason, applicable here, that an hypothesis has no force in ascertaining fact or to explain or account for alleged phenomena, only as such hypothesis excludes every other explanation and every other hypothesis, save the one under consideration.¹

Here, then, we have three new and collateral issues raised by the contentions of the critics, when we are trying the one fundamental issue, i. e., the alleged pre-Pentateuchal existence of the alleged E and J narratives. Here, again, the affirmative and burden of proof are upon these critics.

¹ Greenleaf, *Evidence*, sec. 11.

No. 1 is to be tried by testing the hypothesis upon the Pentateuch to determine whether partitioning it by the criteria of the alternation of the divine names will work. Can it work? Is it workable? The test can be made by any one, remembering that, in our English translation, the word LORD, printed in small capitals, stands for the Hebrew word Jehovah, and the word God, with capital initial, stands for the Hebrew word Elohim.

The scheme of hypothesis No. 1 contemplates applying the hypothesis to the whole Pentateuch; but applying it in a few instances may enable us to determine whether the hypothesis will work or is workable. If, on actual trial, the hypothesis will not work in one instance, it explodes the hypothesis; disproves its validity. We will test it by applying it to the record of the trial of the faith of Abraham (Gen. xxii.). Higher critics sunder out the first fourteen verses of the chapter to make part of their proposed Elohist narrative. Sundering the chapter differently does not relieve the difficulty produced.¹

Reading Elohim in place of God, and Jehovah in place of LORD, the record is (Am. Rev.): "Elohim did test Abraham,"—required the sacrifice of his son on a mount "I [Elohim] will tell thee of." Abraham journeyed to the place "of which Elohim had told him." Isaac asked for the lamb. Abraham answered, "Elohim will provide the lamb." When they came to "the place Elohim had told him of," Abraham bound Isaac, and laid him upon the altar, and Abraham "took the knife to slay his son." At this crisis, "Jehovah," by the voice of his angel and speaking in the first person, called, "Abraham! Abraham!" and said, "Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything to him; for now I [Jehovah] know thou fearest Elohim, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son,

¹ Orr, *Prob. of the Old Test.*, pp. 234, 235.

thine only son, from me [Jehovah]." "Abraham called the name of the place Jehovah-jireh. . . . In the mount of Jehovah it shall be seen."

Here the title Elohim, including its pronouns, occurs six times; the title Jehovah, including its pronouns, occurs five times. The record of this transaction is one only and inseparable. Consider verse 12. Jehovah says, "For I [Jehovah] know thou fearest Elohim, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me [Jehovah]." This records a single indivisible judgment of God. He announces that Abraham fears Elohim, because Abraham withheld not his son from Jehovah. The reasoning results in the judgment. The thing recorded is one judgment, inseparable, and both divine names are inextricably embodied in it in one verse describing the judgment. This troubles the destructive critics. The application of their hypothesis to the Genesis record does not work, cannot work, is flat failure. The critics cannot by any sophistry or philological ingenuity prevent the failure, which they concede, by the expedients to which they resort (to be presently noticed) to surmount the difficulty. One plain failure condemns a proposed hypothesis. But in unnumbered cases this hypothesis of the critics in attempting to partition the Pentateuch into parallel narratives by the criteria of the alternation of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah fails,—will not work,—is not workable.¹

We will notice particularly one more instance,—the record of Jacob's vow. At Bethel, Jehovah, standing above the ladder, bestowed a great blessing on Jacob, addressing Jacob in a dream, speaking in the first person. Jacob, in words following with literalness the language Jehovah addressed to

¹ See Green, *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, where he illustrates the failures by instance after instance, pp. 92-98; and Orr, *Prob. of the Old Test.*, pp. 233-236.

him in the dream, made that language the substance of the condition of his vow. Passing by much of the record of this incident upon which the hypothesis in question will not work, we note the result of attempting to apply the hypotheses on verses 20, 21, and 22 (Gen. xxviii.).

Higher critics sunder these verses out of Genesis to be a part of their manufactured Elohist narrative. The verses read: "And Jacob vowed a vow, saying, If Elohim will be with me and will keep me in the way I go, and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace, then shall Jehovah be my Elohim; and this stone, which I have set for a pillar, shall be Elohim's house, and of all that thou [Jehovah] shall give me, I will give the tenth unto thee [Jehovah]." Here Elohim occurs three times, and Jehovah with its pronouns occurs three times.

Here is recorded one sole, single, inseparable act—Jacob's vow. The divine names Elohim and Jehovah are inextricably embedded in the vow, each three times. Considered juridically, the word "if" joins indissolubly the vow to the condition, and the condition to the vow. The condition feeds the vow, is the consideration that makes the vow obligatory. Strike out the consideration, the vow is naught. Strike out the vow, and the consideration has no function. Neither the obligation of the vow, nor the condition it rests upon, is anything without the other. Neither vow nor condition has any function except as constituting the vow a unit.

The critics' hypothesis applied here is clear, flat failure. The failure in this and other instances is conclusive. The critics' hypothesis as to the criteria of the alternation of the two names—the basis of their proposition No. 1—is false by actual demonstration, by applying the hypothesis, and thereby demonstrating its positive failure. The hypothesis is not only

unproved, and so condemned, but it is positively disproved by the ordeal of actual test. This is conclusive that the hypothesis (the critics' foundation of proposition No. 1) must be rejected and held for naught. Therefore all schemes, conclusions, theories, and claims built upon or dependent upon that false foundation must also perish with it.

EXPEDIENTS AND DEVICES BY CRITICS TO CURE FAILURES.

These critics, however, contend that by expedients and devices they surmount or remedy all the failures of their hypothesis No. 1 to work. These expedients, schemes, and devices require more than casual consideration; for it may well be questioned whether conservative writers and scholars have adequately apprehended the intrinsic and germinal vice and evil that inhere in the expedients and schemes proposed and employed by these critics in manufacturing from the Pentateuch these two alleged parallel narratives, variant often, *as they manufacture them*, in phrase, style, diction, and allusion,—variances caused by the manufacture itself. It is these alleged parallel narratives so manufactured that furnish opportunity for unbounded scope of imagination to critics for presuming and imputing motives and purposes to the supposed authors of such manufactured parallel narratives to fit anything,—any concepts or schemes the destructive critic may choose to evolve, from the product—the narratives they themselves so manufacture. This evil will be disclosed more distinctively in a quotation we propose to make later from Dr. Green dealing directly with alleged parallel narratives, manufactured from an original single one, illustrating the ease with which false conclusions, contradictions, and discrepancies may be produced by the methods of the critics, and by manufactured narratives made by them.

What are the expedients and devices brought forward by these critics to remedy the failures of their said hypothesis to work? Stated in propositions that may be dealt with by juridical tests, they are:—

(a) These critics invent and allege the existence and acts of a personage they designate as Redactor (or R), who works upon matter already written, and prepares it for publication, putting it in literary form.

(b) They invent all possible acts, neglects, errors, and misdeeds of their alleged functionary,—the redactor,—by which every failure of their said hypotheses to work, or be workable, they claim to remedy or cure.

To illustrate, we may note how the critics attempt to remedy the failure of their hypothesis to work on the record of Jacob's vow. Conceding the failure of their hypothesis to work here, they attempt to cure it by asserting and insisting that, before Genesis was written, the alleged E and J narratives actually existed—(a brazen begging of the very question we are trying). They resort to *petitio principii* again by insisting that there was nothing in the alleged E and J narratives that warranted inserting in Jacob's vow the words "then shall Jehovah be my God," and that their alleged redactor wrongfully wrote those words in Genesis. Thereupon these critics of the Bible alter the Bible record, as Dr. Green says, "arbitrarily," by striking out (of Genesis) "then shall Jehovah be my God."¹ Dr. Orr says that these words of Genesis "are forcibly excised" from the Bible by these critics.²

In the case of Abraham above stated, the critics aver that they cure the failure by insisting (without any evidence whatever to justify it) that the redactor wrote in Genesis one

¹ Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, p. 95.

² Problem of the Old Test., p. 234.

divine name when he ought to have written the other. As Dr. Orr states,¹ this functionary redactor is invoked by these critics to "interpolate," "to alter," to correct, what the critics claim were mistakes in the Bible record, and so they change the record to fit their hypotheses *ad infinitum*.

These critics do not claim any principle or standard by which to test any alleged act of their invented redactor beforehand. When their hypothesis as to the alternation of the divine names fails to work, in any instance, these critics invent and insist upon any scheme, device, or expedient that seems to them adapted to cure or remedy the failure, and charge it to their functionary, the redactor, and so relieve their trouble, and make what is actual failure appear to be success. Dr. Orr aptly compares these expedients of constant resort to invention of acts, neglects, errors, of their invented functionary R to like resort to invented epicycles of the Ptolemaic astronomers, to sustain their false claim that the earth was central, and the sun moved around it. When any fact, or conclusion from facts, showed the Ptolemaic theory untrue, those astronomers, to relieve their trouble, invented epicycles to explain and surmount the difficulty.

Such inventions of epicycles were really inventions of subterfuges to make what in fact was false appear to be true. The comparison by Dr. Orr is most just, and assists us in understanding the character and quality of the violent and baseless expedients these critics resort to to attempt to remedy the unnumbered flat failures of their hypothesis to work when put to actual test. The record of matters we, as well as the critics, are dealing with, lies at the foundation of faith in the Christian religion and of the Christian church. The element of ethics is inevitably involved in the matter under examina-

¹ Prob. of the Old Test., pp. 221-226.

tion; it cannot be eliminated nor ignored. We will try to illustrate the ethics of these expedients of the critics.

When a dishonest accountant being required to produce a balance-sheet finds when provisionally prepared it demonstrates that the accounts will not balance, he invents a false item to go into the accounts, so that when it has passed through the journal and ledger into the balance-sheet, it shall exactly fit the discrepancy, and cause the balance-sheet to appear to show the accounts to balance. He thus causes his dishonest accounts to appear honest. That expedient in commercial terms is known as "forcing a balance." The essence of such dishonest transaction seems to describe the essence of the unnumbered fictitious inventions of these critics, invented to make what is false appear to be true, to make the flat and positive failures of these hypotheses appear to be successes. This is done by these critics even to the extent of expurgating, altering, adding to, and changing the Bible record—mutilating the Word of God. When the little damsel was requested by her Sunday-school teacher to define mendacity, using Scripture expressions, she answered, A lie is "an abomination of the Lord," but "a present help in time of trouble." These invented doings of the critics' redactor seem to fall within both branches of the damsel's definition.

Remitting further consideration of the ethics of these inventions of the critics, let us see how the inventions fare when subjected to the ordeal of trial by the rules and standards of juridical science. The critics' new propositions (*a*) and (*b*) come inevitably under the exacting grip and demand of the maxim which calls upon the critics to prove their propositions,—make them "good" by "proof" or they cannot be "held" for any purpose. We deny the alleged redactor and deny his alleged performances. This again produces new collateral

issues. Here, again, the affirmative and burden of proof rest upon these critics. What evidence do they produce to establish as fact that their invented functionary R existed, and especially acted as they allege? None. The judgment of judicial science, on failure of evidence, is, *ipso facto*, that the critics' allegations (a) and (b) fail, are invalid, repudiated, and all claims, inferences, and conclusions founded on them must be held for naught.

But this is not all. The very expedients the critics resort to, to remedy failures of their hypotheses, are suicidal,—result in plain *felo de se*. Take, for illustration, the critics' attempt to remedy the failure of their hypotheses, when applied to the record of Jacob's vow. To cure that failure, the critics strike out of the Bible record in Genesis the words "then shall Jehovah be my God."

The book of Genesis is an Ancient Document. The rule of jurisprudence regarding ancient documents is stated by Greenleaf.

"Every document, apparently ancient, coming from the proper repository or custody, and bearing on its face no evident marks of forgery, the law presumes to be genuine." "An Ancient Document, offered in evidence in our courts, is said to come from the proper repository, when it is found in the place where, and under the care of persons, with whom such writings might naturally and reasonably be expected to be found; for it is this custody which gives authenticity to documents found within it.¹ . . . The presumption of law is the judgment of charity. It presumes that every man is innocent until he is proved guilty; *that everything has been done fairly and legally, until it has been proved otherwise*; and that every document, found in its proper repository, and not bearing the marks of forgery, is genuine. Now this is precisely the case with the Sacred Writings. They have been used in the church from time immemorial, and are thus found in the place where alone they ought to be looked for. They

¹Tindal, Ch. J., in *Bishop of Meath v. Marquis of Winchester*, 3 Bing. N. C. 183, 200, 201. See too Greenleaf on Ev. sec. 142; 1 Starkie on Ev. pp. 332-335, 381-386; *Croughton v. Blake*, 12 Mees. & W. 205, 208; *Doe v. Phillips*, 10 Jur. 34.

come to us, and challenge our reception of them as genuine writings, precisely as Domesday Book, the Ancient Statutes of Wales, or any others of the ancient documents recently published, under the British Record Commission, are received. They are found in familiar use in all the churches of Christendom, as the sacred books to which all denominations of Christians refer, as the standard of their faith."¹

The contention of these critics is that their hypothesis of the alternation of the divine names will work on the Ancient Document the book of Genesis, but when they strike out from Genesis the clause "then shall Jehovah be my God," what is left is no longer the book of Genesis, on which that hypothesis is being tested, but by that expurgation it has become another and different book; different by the expurgation of the very matter which shows the hypotheses will not work. That the hypotheses will work on the expurgated relic is entirely immaterial. It cannot support in the least the contention of the critics, any more than would their showing that the hypothesis would work on a chapter in Josephus or on a fable of Æsop. To propose to a competent court that an hypothesis that would not work on a passage of Genesis as it is would work if the clause that prevented its working was stricken out, would not only make the proponent the laughing-stock of intelligent hearers, but, if persisted in, would receive merited rebuke from the court. Yet that is what these critics have succeeded in palming off as true, it seems, upon many in the ministry and many engaged in educational work. This expurgation from Genesis of Jacob's vow is only one of unnumbered instances of like changing the Bible record by these critics to make failures of their hypotheses to work appear to be successes.²

We next consider the critics' contention No. 2, i. e., that, because a narrative can be partitioned, and two new ones be

¹ Testimony of Evangelists, pp. 7-8; Evidences, secs. 34, 142, 570.

² Prob. of the Old Test., pp. 220-235.

manufactured from the severed parts, therefore, the original must have been composite, made from the two thus manufactured. The falsity of this contention of the critics has been demonstrated. Dr. Green has taken the parable spoken by Christ on the Prodigal Son, and demonstrated that by merely employing the methods (including use of redactor) of the critics, the language of the parable can be partitioned into two complete narratives, designated respectively A and B,¹ agreeing in some points and disagreeing in others, and each having its special characteristics. We quote in part what Dr. Green shows is accomplished by the operation.

" . . . The only deficiencies are enclosed in parentheses, and may be readily explained as omissions by the redactor in effecting the combination. A clause must be supplied at the beginning of B, a subject is wanting in ver. 13b, and ver. 25b, and the verb 'said' is wanting in ver. 23. As these omissions occur exclusively in B, it may be inferred that the redactor placed A at the basis, and incorporated B into it with only such slight changes as were necessary to adapt it to this purpose.

"The differences are quite as striking as the points of agreement. A distinguishes the sons as elder and younger; B makes no mention of their relative ages. In A the younger obtained his portion by solic-

¹ We regret that lack of space prevents our giving the entire parable as partitioned by Dr. Green. See his *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, pp. 119-124; also *The Bible Student and Teacher*, May, 1907, vol. vi. pp. 355-359.

THE PRODIGAL SON, Luke xv. 11-32.

A

11. A certain man had two sons: 12. and the younger of them said to his father, Father give me the portion of thy substance that falleth to me. . . . 13. And not many days after the younger son gathered all together . . . and there he wasted his substance with riotous living. . . .

14b. and he began to be in want.

16b. And no man gave unto him.

B

(A certain man had two sons): 12b. and he divided unto them his living.

13b. And (one of them) took his journey into a far country. . . . 14. And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that country. . . . 15. And he went and joined himself to one of the citizens of that country; and he sent him into his fields to feed swine. 16. And he would fain have been filled with the husks that the swine did eat.

itation, and the father retained the remainder in his own possession; in B the father divided his property between both of his sons of his own motion. In A the prodigal remained in his father's neighborhood, and reduced himself to penury by riotous living; in B he went to a distant country and spent all his property, but there is no intimation that he indulged in unseemly excesses. It would rather appear that he was injudicious; and to crown his misfortunes there occurred a severe famine. His fault seems to have consisted in having gone so far away from his father and from the holy land, and in engaging in the unclean occupation of tending swine. In A the destitution seems to have been chiefly want of clothing; in B want of food. Hence in A the father directed the best robe and ring and shoes to be brought for him; in B the fatted calf was killed. In B the son came from a distant land, and the father saw him afar off; in A he came from the neighborhood, and the father ran at once and fell on his neck and kissed him. In B he had been engaged in a menial occupation and so bethought himself of his father's hired servants, and asked to be made a servant himself; in A he had been living luxuriously, and while confessing his unworthiness makes no request to be put on the footing of a servant. In A the father speaks of his son having been dead because of his profligate life; in B of his having been lost because of his absence in a distant land. In A, but not in B, the other son was displeased at the reception given to the prodigal. And here it would appear that R has slightly altered the text. The elder son must have said to his father in A, 'When this thy son came, which hath devoured thy substance with harlots, thou didst put on him the best robe.' The redactor has here substituted the B word 'living' for 'substance' which is used by A; and with the view of making a better contrast with 'kid' he has introduced the B phrase, 'thou killedst for him the fatted calf.'"

This illustrates the method of operation in manufacturing alleged parallel E and J narratives. It is not necessary to multiply illustrations, for this one cited, and a like analysis by Dr. Green of the parable of the Good Samaritan¹ show the method and means by which critics effect partition of the Pentateuch, and how, in thus manufacturing alleged ante-Pentateuchal narratives, E and J, they themselves in the very process of manufacture produce alleged discrepancies and contradictions where none really exist, and where none could be created, had the writer of Genesis used one ancient narra-

¹ Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, p. 122.

tive only, either oral or written, as a source in writing the book. It is the vice of manufacturing two or more narratives of the same matters of the Pentateuch that gives destructive critics the means and opportunity to imagine, conceive, create, and deduce alleged divergencies, contradictions, and destructive conclusions, with which they attack the verity of the Bible. This may explain why the critics hold so tenaciously to their theory of parallel narratives of sources of the Pentateuch. Higher critics treat parallel documents as witnesses. One says, "How blind to what we might learn from the divergencies of our witnesses the man who can do no better than to hurry to the rescue with the harmonistic suggestion."¹ This they do, by simply sundering what properly belong together. A method of critical analysis that can be made, by the critics' manipulation, to prove everything, even a literary unit, a parable of Christ, to be composite, is thereby condemned. It demonstrates that such method of analysis cannot be trusted or allowed as a means or method to prove anything.

By the critics' proposition or hypothesis No. 3, they contend that they account for what, they assert, imperatively demands explanation, viz., phenomenal alternate occurrences of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah in the Pentateuch: and that they thereby further support their contention of the preëxistence of the alleged E and J narratives, as parallel sources of that portion of the Bible. In the early part of Genesis (the first five chapters) we find conspicuous instances of alternate occurrence of the divine names, *but not afterwards*.

In juridical science, an hypothesis is a theory proposed in explanation of facts or phenomena in a case.² But, as hereto-

¹ B. W. Bacon, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 73.

² Anderson, *Law Lexicon*, p. 519.

fore noted, an hypothesis is not admissible and has no value,—is not admissible in administering jurisprudence,—unless it excludes every other explanation of the phenomena and excludes every other hypothesis but the one proposed and under consideration. Hence this contention No. 3 of the critics involves the primary inquiry whether the alternation of the divine names in the Pentateuch, even in the first five chapters of Genesis, is phenomenal in fact or whether, on the contrary, the situation, conditions, and subject-matter recorded, and the relation of Deity thereto, and the literary character of the record do not rationally and fully account for, and explain, all alternating occurrences of the divine names.

Bible students, including extreme critics, agree in discovering a discrimination in usage in the Bible between the names Elohim and Jehovah. "God Elohim denotes the Divine Being in his relation to the universe at large, as creator, preserver and governor of all his creatures and all their actions." In the other relation, "Jehovah denotes God as he reveals himself to man, especially in grace."¹

The Bible record exhibits the discrimination by usage—the usage of the writer in employing for record one or the other divine name according as one or the other name as so discriminated was related to the subject-matter being recorded. But, as the relation of Deity to such subject-matter was not always one only of those aspects, but sometimes involved that of both, either was used or both divine names were recorded together, according to the subject-matter successively, as seen in the record.

The question recurs, Is there any other explanation of the

¹ J. D. Davis, *Bible Dictionary*, p. 565. In line with this, see Driver, *Introduction*, p. 13; Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, p. 56; Orr, *Prob. of the Old Test.*, p. 225; Green, *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, p. 105.

alternate use of the names Elohim and Jehovah in the Pentateuch, except the hypothesis of the critics, that it was caused by embodying in it alternate sections from the alleged E and J narratives? If any other explanation is established, it repudiates the critics' hypothesis. Biblical writers, in classifying periods covered by the Pentateuch, set off the period from creation to the birth of Noah, embraced in the first five chapters of Genesis, as "The Antediluvian Age, Gen. i.-v."¹ Genesis of that period is not full history of the time, but records a series of episodes plus one unique chapter of genealogy.

The first chapter of Genesis and the first three verses of the second chapter record the episode of Creation. It names six successive creation periods, in each of which mighty acts of creation were wrought. During all the time occupied in these creation periods, until the sixth period, there was no human being in existence to whom God could appear as "Jehovah"—God of revelation and grace. The relation of Deity to the Creation Episode was specifically that of Creator (Elohim). The subject-matter and conditions recorded, and the relation of God to them, suggested as the appropriate divine name, Elohim, and Elohim is used throughout. This rationally and fully accounts for the use of Elohim in this episode, and we can confidently say that that is all there is of it.

The next episode is Genesis ii. 4-25; that which records the planting of a garden by God, his installing man in it, and starting man on his career to subdue to man's use the powers God had set in the world, and to attain and establish moral character, such as should fit man to apprehend, love, commune, and covenant with Jehovah. This last was to be

¹ Green, *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, p. 30.

accomplished by test and trial of man, his meeting temptation to disobey, but overcoming and obeying because his Creator (Elohim) so commanded. The subject-matter of this episode, and the relation of Deity to it, rationally required the discriminating name Jehovah, and with literary appropriateness the record has Jehovah throughout that episode. But the episode embraces also the apprehension of Deity as Creator, which shows him rightful lawgiver for man. Both aspects of Deity are here distinctly related to the subject-matter; both names are suggested, and Elohim is added to Jehovah all through this episode. But this is not all. The name Elohim is added to Jehovah in apposition. Apposition is the addition of a parallel word or phrase by way of explanation or illustration of another. This accords with the situation and seems reasonably to justify adding the name Elohim to Jehovah in this episode. The rhetorical use of apposition is distinctive in Hebrew literature, as shown in Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, etc. This prominent element of apposition in Hebrew literature might be deemed sufficient alone to account for the addition of Elohim to Jehovah in this episode. So, too, does the subject-matter and the relation of Deity to it. Again we say confidently that the use of the divine names together (Jehovah Elohim) in the second episode is clearly accounted for by the subject-matter and condition recorded, and the relation of Deity thereto, and no hypothesis is required or permissible to explain it.

The next episode (Gen. iii.) is that of the temptation of Adam and Eve, their failure, and God's dealing with that failure. As literature, the record of this episode consists of dialogue and narration. The duty of one recording dialogue is to record the names the speakers use, in the dialogue, *verbatim et literatim*. It is quotation. The writer, the

editor, does not select the words, but records the selection of names made by participants in the dialogue.¹ Genesis is an Ancient Document, and the legal presumption is that the record of the dialogue in the document has thus been made correctly,² and there is no evidence to the contrary. This record begins with dialogue. The tempter, called Serpent, employs the name Elohim in the dialogue with Eve, and Eve uses Elohim in her replies. That accounts for the use of Elohim in that connection. The narrative part of the chapter has the divine names again in apposition (Jehovah Elohim). The subject-matter is the command of "Jehovah Elohim" of chapter ii.; disobedience by Adam and Eve, and the penalty therefor. This episode grew out of the episode recorded in chapter ii. and is directly connected with it. The subject-matter, conditions, and the relation of Deity to them and dialogue, fully explain this employment of the divine names as recorded in this episode, and no hypothesis is required or juridically admissible in the matter.

The next episode records the birth of Cain and Seth, the worship by Cain and Abel; the murder of Abel, and God's judgment upon Cain (Gen. iv.). The record here embraces monologue and narration. The recorder's duty regarding monologue is identical with his duty in recording dialogue, i. e., to record the names the speaker uses. The legal presump-

¹ In his *Notes Critical and Practical on Genesis*, Professor George Bush considers and accounts for the observable variances in the use of the divine names which he seems to have found only in the first five chapters of Genesis, for he names each of those and no others, and notes in explanation of those variances the distinction in composition between narration and recording personal discourse, dialogue, or monologue and states the rule, "When a quotation is made, then, as the fidelity of history requires, the name used by the person introduced as speaker is inserted" (vol. i. p. xxxiv).

²Greenleaf, *Evidence*, p. 22.

tion is that the duty was here performed correctly and there is no evidence to the contrary. At the beginning of the chapter upon the birth of Cain, Eve said, "I have gotten me a man from Jehovah," and that name is continued in narrative to verse 25, at the end of the chapter. At the birth of Seth, Eve, speaking in the first person, says, "For Elohim hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew" (ver. 25). Monologue accounts for those alternations of the divine names. The choosing the names was the choice of Eve, not the selection of the writer or editor of Genesis. In the narrative part of the record of this episode the divine name Jehovah is employed, following its use by Eve. The relation of Deity to the subject-matter suggested the name Jehovah, which regards him as receiving worship from man and dealing with men as Ruler and Preserver. The situation, conditions, and subject-matter, the relation of Deity to them, and monologue, fully account for the alternation of the divine names in this chapter.

The next chapter (Gen. v.) is the unique combination of genealogy and chronology during the Antediluvian Age. The chapter begins with the creation of Adam, and appropriately continues the name Elohim spoken by Eve in preceding chapters. "Enoch walked with Elohim" and "was not, for Elohim took him." The relation of Deity to the subject-matter was that of Elohim (Creator), and Elohim is retained. But when the genealogy comes to the birth of Noah, the record again has monologue. Lamech the father, speaking in the first person, calls his son's name "Noah," saying, "This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands because of the ground Jehovah has cursed." The legal presumption is that the divine name quoted in the monologue was chosen by Lamech, and not by the writer of Genesis, and

was truly recorded, and there is no evidence to the contrary. Here again the subject-matter, condition, and relation of Deity to the matters involved and monologue fully and rationally account for the alternation of the divine names in this chapter, as we have now seen they do in every episode in the Antediluvian Age. There is neither need nor permissible place for the critics' hypothesis to account for the alternations.

The importance of this explanation of the cause of alternation of divine names in the record will appear more vividly perhaps if we consider the significant fact that the alternations caused by quoting names used by speakers in dialogue or monologue is *double* the number occurring in narration.¹

Nowhere else in the Bible do we find any such apparently phenomenal series of instances of alternation of the divine names as are found in the first five chapters of Genesis. It justifies the conclusion that, had it not been for such apparently phenomenal alternation of the names in the Antediluvian

¹ 1. Gen. ii. 4 from "Elohim" to "Jehovah Elohim" in narration.

2. Gen. iii. 1 from "Jehovah Elohim" to "Elohim" in dialogue.

3. Gen. iii. 8 from "Elohim" to "Jehovah Elohim" in narration.

4. Gen. iv. 1 from "Jehovah Elohim" to "Jehovah" in monologue.

5. Gen. v. 25 from "Jehovah" to "Elohim" in monologue.

6. Gen. v. 29 from "Elohim" to "Jehovah" in monologue.

Change of divine names caused by quoting names used by speakers in dialogue or monologue, 4; occurring in narration, 2.

This is approximately the ratio throughout the Pentateuch. A rapid scrutiny of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers disclosed one hundred and forty changes of divine names caused by quoting names used by speakers in such discourse, and eighty changes occurring in narration, a ratio of 7 to 4.

Deuteronomy (excepting the last chapter) is monologue throughout. It begins, "These are the words Moses spake," and so continues. The name Moses uses is "Jehovah thy Elohim," with appropriate inflections of the pronoun. In some eight instances when Elohim is used alone, as in ch. iv. 33, 34, it is still used in monologue. The last chapter is narration of termination of Moses' life, and employs the divine name Jehovah only.

period, we should never have heard of the critics' partition theory, or of the alleged E, J, *et al.* narratives as parallel sources of the Pentateuch.

To one who looks no deeper into matters embraced in the Antediluvian record than to merely count the number of alternations of divine names, those alternations may seem phenomenal. But when they are considered in connection with the situation,—quoted dialogue, monologue, subject-matter, and the relation of Deity to what is there recorded,—there is nothing phenomenal in the frequent alternations of names there seen. That frequency is rationally and completely accounted for by the conditions and subject-matter recorded and the relation of Deity thereto, as well as by recording the names speakers used in dialogue and monologue. Such thorough examination of the subject-matter recorded, the relations of Deity to it, and of the literary character of the record is merely the application of the Scientific Method of examination to the record, and what is embraced in it. That method, carried through the Pentateuch, will, and does, explain every other instance of alternation of the divine names throughout the whole.¹

The limits of this article preclude continuing such test to other instances in the remainder of the Pentateuch, and it is not necessary, for the tests can be applied successfully by any one sufficiently interested to be thorough.

¹ See all instances of alternation of the divine names in Genesis examined by Dr. Green, in his *Unity of Genesis*.

ARTICLE IV.

SOME PERILS OF CURRENT VIEWS OF
IMMANENCE.

BY GEORGE S. ROLLINS, D.D., SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

EVERY great and precious truth suffers from perversion. Unfair applications are made of it, unjustifiable conclusions are drawn from it, and sometimes it is so confused with specious error as either to lose its proper place and function, or be put under the ban of suspicion. Such is the peril that now threatens that inspiring and comforting conception of God comprehended under the term *immanence*. When the preacher refers to some aspects of this doctrine, unless he is unusually clear and discriminating, he will be misunderstood. Either he will be set down as a pantheist, or be interpreted as favoring Christian Science, Theosophy, New Thought, or some other of the current sects, most of which are propagating a jumble of subjective idealism and Hindu pantheism.

WHAT IMMANENCE IS.

1. It is a theory of the mode of the divine existence. Immanence means indwelling. It is the essential indwelling of God in the universe. Yet he is distinct *from* the universe which he has made and is superior to it. Bowne defines the doctrine thus: "God is the omnipresent ground of all finite existence . . . the world continually depends upon, and is upheld by the ever-living, ever-present, ever-working God." Illingworth, basing his view upon the analogy of the indwelling spirit of man in his body, says: "The divine presence

which we recognize in nature will be the presence of a Spirit which infinitely transcends the material order, yet indwells it." John Caird affirms: "God is not simply the Creator of the world, but the inward principle and ground of its being." Clark describes immanence as "omnipresent energy," and adds, "Immanence means that God is everywhere and always present in the universe, while transcendence means that He is not limited by it. He is a free Spirit inhabiting His universe, but surpassing it." Some one has illustrated the immanence of God in the world by a sponge filled with water. The water is in every part of the sponge. The illustration fails in that it contains no suggestion of the transcendence of God. It seems to invest God in the world in such a way as to deprive him of freedom and transcendence. Illingworth's suggestion is wiser. God is in his world as I am in my body. Yet I am greater than my body. I transcend it. I am in every part of my body, potentially. It may be convenient to aid thought with some such illustration, because it is difficult to associate our ideas of personality with that of a universal Spirit. We are accustomed to thinking in the terms of time and space. Hence we localize God. The Hebrews did the same thing. Yet the attempt to free the idea of God from spatial limitations is inevitable in the evolution of human thought. Pfeiderer says: "God is neither *in* space, nor *outside* of space, but Himself spaceless, founds space; i. e. embraces in Himself all that is in space as mutually related and connected in Himself in the articulated world." When this task of thinking God free from the categories of time and space is accomplished, the conception of immanence will be more thoroughly appreciated.

Human thought upon God's relation to the world has oscillated between two extremes; from the deistic conception, which entirely removes him from active relation to the world,

to the pantheistic, which identifies him with it, so investing him in it as to obliterate his personality and destroy his freedom. Deism denies his omnipresence; pantheism denies his omnipotence. The task of Christian thought is to find the middle ground, in a union of *immanence* and *transcendence*. The deistic notion of God persists in the pernicious and confusing distinction between "natural" and "supernatural," in our doctrine of special providences, and in much of our praying, which implies God's externality to nature and asks for his entrance into it for a special act. Pantheism, on the other hand, so identifies God with nature as to resolve him into an impersonal force virtually imprisoned within matter, and, equally with deism, makes answer to prayer impossible. God is the only reality. The world and all it contains is but a phantom. Spinoza declared: "It is only imagination that lends to things seen and temporal the appearance of reality." Thus in the Being of an absolute God disappear the freedom and personality of man. "All is God," as Mrs. Eddy says, and in her hope of being "assimilated to God," she agrees with Hinduism that salvation issues in re-absorption into the Being of God. As John Caird says: "This union with the Infinite is union with vacuity."

2. The Christian view of immanence is close to pantheism. The check is the transcendent idea. God is transcendent as well as immanent. He is in his world but is greater than the world. The universe is an organism of which he is the life and power. Its laws and processes are God's operations manifesting himself and unfolding his purpose. In the same way he indwells and sustains man. This view avoids the unnatural distinction between the natural and the supernatural, which is a relic of deism, and father of the notion of special providences as the *principal* evidences of God's presence and power in the

world. At every moment and in every place he is working in and controlling nature. "Nothing is more natural than the supernatural." Nothing so clearly evinces his presence and mastery as this regularity and beneficence.

Here is the meeting ground of philosophy, science, and theology. Philosophy, as in the teaching of Lotze, holds to the idea of a universal energy which establishes order in the universe. Physical science is approaching the same position. Behind all natural phenomena there is an unseen, immeasurable power that causes evolutions and multiplications. What is this power? The scientist may answer, "I do not know," but the *fact* he acknowledges. The Christian theist says: "This is the immanent, transcendent God." This force exhibits tokens of personality as we understand personality. It works in an orderly way. It works toward definite ends. These ends are moral. Here we come in sight of a personal, moral Being as the ground of all things. So long as science pauses with phenomena and laws, it stops just short of a sufficiently comprehensive idea to include the cause and continuance of laws and phenomena. Neither does it account for man, his freedom, moral nature, and universal religiousness. Unless science boldly seeks a ground idea broad enough to include *all* these, it is chargeable with defeat or cowardice. It is forced to the alternative, materialism or theism. As Le Conte said, "Either God operates motion, or motion operates itself." Thus science and philosophy will ultimately unite in the Christian confession of God.

DIFFICULTIES AND DANGERS.

1. Philosophical difficulties.

(1) How shall we reconcile immanence and human freedom? If God is immanent and active in man as he is in the

world, how can man's actions be free? This is the old problem, and it is unanswerable ultimately. We have to fall back upon experience rather than upon any philosophic principle. We know that we are measurably free, and yet we all realize our dependence upon God.

In the attempt to shed light upon this problem, suppose we begin with the biblical declaration that man is "made in the image of God." This likeness must be sought in the spiritual constitution of man. He has made us sharers in his nature. May this not be in reason, love, and freedom? If we were to develop normally, would it not be in the direction of the divine nature? Freedom, however, makes possible the choice of sin, which hinders the natural development of these capacities. Now while God is present within us, it is not as a coercive power, but as a persuasive moral influence, as the principle of a higher life. No one holds that he is independent of God, or that he would continue to exist if God were absent. We all depend, good and bad alike, continually upon him. That within this general dependence we have a relative independence is the conviction of experience. For, *first*, we have certain feelings and thoughts, and perform certain deeds which are our own. It is absurd to ascribe them to another. We certainly could not attribute them to God without involving more insoluble problems still. For example, if God thinks my thoughts, with all their errors and uncertainties, how can he be the Supreme Reason at the same time? Multiply this by the number of finite spirits, and we have innumerable confusions in God, which are insoluble as long as we think of him as playing both sides of the game. *Secondly*, when we reflect upon our life as a whole, we are unable to regard it as completely self-sufficient and self-centered. We do not know how these two, myself and God, are joined, how immanence

and freedom agree, yet we know we cannot abandon either without faring worse. We must agree upon the coexistence and the separateness of the finite and the Infinite, which make possible moral relations and moral government. Through moral union with Him there must be an ever-increasing immanence of God in man, which Paul has described as the "fullness of the measure of the stature of Christ." Sin is the wrong use of freedom, and, as far as it rules, hinders this immanence of God in us.

(2) There is a second difficulty. How, on the basis of a thoroughgoing immanence, can we account for the evil in the world? If God is personally present and directly acting in the forces of nature, why is he not the immediate agent of all the dreadful things that occur—storms, earthquakes, famines, plagues, wrecks—as well as the direct inspirer of all the savagery of beasts? Here again it is easier to ask than to answer. The universe is a vast organism, slowly developing according to orderly, beneficent laws. Great ends are to be served. The individual subserves the need of the whole. Many things which we deem evil, may not be so from God's point of view, or when we consider the high ends which they serve, and the progress which they inspire. Walker declares that God as he is in himself is not in the world, but only his reason is here carrying on the process of evolution. Hence God cannot be held responsible for the so-called evils.¹ But this involves an unthinkable and incredible diremption of divine personality. If God is to give rise to such an intelligible world as we see, peopled with a race of free beings, the experiences which now seem so dreadful cannot be avoided save as human progress eliminates them. God is perfect Reason, hence he works in the best possible way and this is the best possible

¹ Christian Theism and Spiritual Monism, pp. 247-250.

world. He cannot abrogate himself to spare his children the pain of progress, otherwise how would they gain dominion of nature at all? How could a race of free rational beings develop into God-likeness, if spared all hardships? God cannot always spare us and at the same time make us.

2. We note some dangers of a pantheistic interpretation of immanence.

(1) Some current views of immanence tend to obliterate the personality of God. The insistence that God is in every cell of the body, in every atom of matter, and in every portion of space, renders the conception of the divine Being nebulous and impersonal. He becomes "The Only Substance," "The All of Things." In short, we have pantheism pure and simple. Most of the religious fads are founded upon this conception of God borrowed from the East. Christian Science denies the reality of matter. All is mind. That mind is God. We are but fragments of God. Our goal is "assimilation to God." Thus disappear together the personality of God and man in the "motionless abyss of the unconditioned." The emptiness and hopelessness of such a philosophy (for it is not religion) needs no further comment.

(2) One notes also the pantheistic construction of immanence that shuts God up to a prearranged order, which he cannot transgress. This denial of transcendence leaves us as helpless as under deism. Prayer concerning affairs in the physical order is futile, because the answer to such a prayer would involve disturbance in nature and changeableness in God.

The element of truth in this view is the point of departure toward false conclusions. Obviously God has an orderly method of conducting the universe. We call it law. But God, not law, is the ultimate fact. This regular and beneficent way of work-

ing is evidence of God's presence. But to affirm that he is shut up to these *observable* ways, or known laws, is quite another thing. To do so is to affirm that we have compassed the physical order and have acquired exhaustive knowledge of the divine methods and resources. For if we have *not* mastered nature and exhausted God, events which we term miraculous may occur according to laws deeper than we now know. If God is free and supreme, who dares to assert that the *visible* processes of nature include the entire range of his activities? But this is exactly what is implied in a theory of immanence which agrees with materialism in denying God's transcendence over nature. It is strange, indeed, if God cannot work in ways as much beyond *us* as our present knowledge surpasses that of the ancient Hebrews, who called many events miraculous that are not so to us. If God is really transcendent as well as immanent, then events outside the *known* order may occur. We call them "miracles" (an unfortunate term), conveying the idea that they are opposed to nature, which is impossible if God is immanent in nature. Back of the observed laws of nature is the divine causality. God works in his world freely. Uniformity and change are alike the expressions of his will, and neither can disturb the ongoing of the universe. Such an event as the resurrection of Jesus is as possible as is the revolution of the world on its axis.

Those who hold to an immanence which denies the possibility of "miracles" and the validity of prayer save as a reflex influence, endeavor to escape the logic of their position by affirming that God is free and transcendent in the spiritual sphere, but limited in the physical. Martineau said: "God may act naturally as a free cause in the spiritual sphere, communicating His grace in answer to prayer."¹ If your child is

¹ Study of Religion, II. 190-194.

ill, God can give you peace and resignation, but he cannot stay the disease. But if the physical order subserves the spiritual, and God is transcendent *and* immanent in both, why may not such an event as the restoration of your child be possible and natural as a revelation of God's presence and goodness?

(3) One of the invariable accompaniments of thoroughgoing immanence is an exaggerated emphasis upon the moral consciousness as the ultimate, if not the exclusive, organ of revelation. One hastens to affirm grateful acceptance of all the light that comes from this source. If there were no other it would be foremost. If we were sinless beings it would be perfect. We believe in the "religion of the spirit" (Sabatier), but this does not warrant an indifferent or contemptuous treatment of the Scriptures, to which we are indebted for the greatest Light, the record of Him who is "Light of the world." The declaration "You may take away the Bible and I will still have my religion," needs explanation. What kind of a religion would it be? Take the Bible out of the world, and what would be the condition in a hundred years? The heathen has a moral consciousness. He has gods. But what gods! Why do we send him the Bible? Plato acknowledged this inner light, but confessed its dimness and longed for a surer word.

Such are some of the tendencies of current views of immanence. It is the peril of pantheism, which robs God of transcendence and personality. It is the peril of religious starvation. It denies the value of prayer, save as a reflex agent. It overemphasizes the authority of the religious consciousness and minimizes the importance of the record of divine revelation contained in the Scriptures. Gladly do we

accept in *general* some theory of divine immanence. God dwells in his world. He works in every part of it, exerting his power and wisdom in sustaining its order and carrying out his beneficent purposes. But we cannot believe that he is actually invested in nature, or shut up to its *observable* order. He is greater than his world. He is *transcendent* as well as immanent.

Does not the acceptance of his *transcendence* and *immanence* in all spheres save us from pantheism and guard against the pantheistic isms rife to-day? Does it not harmonize with Jesus' teaching regarding God's Supremacy and Fatherhood? Does it not save us the reality and value of prayer for all varieties of need? The sovereign, ever-present Father, who notes the sparrow's fall and adorns the blossom of a day, will hear and answer the prayers of his children for temporal *and* spiritual blessings. No fixed, mechanical order of nature compels him to stand helpless to answer the cries of needy men. The humblest or the highest may seek him with confidence. The grounds of this faith are individual and aggregate experience, the beneficence of nature, and the character of God as exhibited in the Christ of the New Testament.

ARTICLE V.

"ISRAEL'S LAWS AND LEGAL PRECEDENTS."¹

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
LINCOLN'S INN, LONDON.

I.

UNDER the title of "Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents," Dr. Charles Foster Kent, Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University, has published a portly volume setting forth the views of the Wellhausen school on the origin of the Pentateuchal legislation. The size and character of the work are such that it can hardly be allowed to pass unnoticed in this Review, but the task of dealing with it is of such a nature that brevity is unfortunately out of the question.

Although he has made himself responsible for a big book on Israelitish law, Dr. Kent, like the other members of his school, is entirely devoid of any tincture of legal knowledge or training. He cannot distinguish a freeman from a slave, a house from an altar, rape from seduction, a yearly tax from a single ransom for souls. He has no acquaintance with legal literature. He does not even know the meanings of the ordinary English legal terms that he uses. He resembles his friends, too, in another matter. No reliance at all can be placed on any statement made by him. His representations may in any particular case turn out to be true or they may be false: but there is no *a priori* probability one way or the other:

¹ Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents. By Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University. 8vo. London: Hodder & Stoughton; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1907.

indeed, from our study of the work, we are not certain that we ought not to go further, and say that the false statements on matters of fact probably greatly outnumber those that are true. Perhaps some instances of this should be given at once.

On page 10 we read the following amazing sentence: "The Old Testament itself, as is well known, does not directly attribute to Moses the literary authorship of even a majority of its laws." This statement is of course false on the face of it: so Dr. Kent pauses to the extent of a semicolon, and then proceeds to contradict it thus: "the passages that place them in his mouth belong to the later editorial framework of the legal books." Now, first, "the later editorial framework," if any, is part of the Old Testament; but, secondly, it is not true that the passages in question all belong to what Dr. Kent regards as "later editorial framework." Take, for instance, Deuteronomy xii. Such passages as "to the place which the LORD your God shall choose out of all your tribes," etc., "for ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance," "thither shall ye bring *all that I command you*," and so on, indicate the literary authorship attributed as clearly as possible. And Dr. Kent himself says as much a few pages later when treating of Deuteronomy. "The whole," he writes (pp. 31-32), "is presented in the form of a farewell address in the mouth of Moses. In him, as their first great representative, the prophets are made to rise above the temporal and local conditions that called them forth, and to proclaim, with divine authority and in specific terms, the principles, humane, political, social, ethical and religious that underlay all their teachings." This, being interpreted, means that, in the view taken by Dr. Kent on these particular pages, all the laws of Deuteronomy and most of the rest of the book are attributed to Moses—albeit by a literary forgery. Or turn to Numbers

xxxv. and read the provisions contained therein. Phrase after phrase is intelligible only on the hypothesis that the children of Israel have not yet entered the land of promise. Nor does Dr. Kent attempt to dispute these facts. He prints these passages and others like them without any attempt to suggest that the innumerable phrases in question are not integral portions of the laws as originally drafted.

Here is another instance of Dr. Kent's statements of fact. According to the Law (Lev. xxiii. 34; Num. xxix. 12), the first day of Tabernacles falls on the fifteenth day of the seventh month. Now, in common with the rest of his school, Dr. Kent makes these passages late, and wishes it to be believed that during the earlier period the date was not fixed. Unfortunately for him there is a passage in the first book of Kings which disposes of this theory. "Jeroboam," we read, "*ordained a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, like unto the feast that is in Judah . . . and he went up unto the altar which he had made in Bethel on the fifteenth day in the eighth month, even in the month which he had devised of his own heart*" (1 Kings xii. 32-33). The meaning is not obscure. Jeroboam held his feast on the right day of the month, but "in the month which he had devised of his own heart," i. e. precisely one month later than the *then date of the feast in Judah*. How does Dr. Kent deal with this? On page 261 he writes of Tabernacles: "Its date is left indeterminate in the pre-exilic codes. . . . In 1 Kings xii. 32 it is stated that Jeroboam arranged that this feast should be observed in Northern Israel in the eighth instead of the seventh month, as was the custom in Judah." The exact date in 1 Kings (fifteenth day), it will be observed, is here ignored. On the next page (262), under the heading "The Sacred Calendar of the Post-exilic Hierarchy," we are told of the great

festivals that "exact dates were *now*¹ fixed for each," the passage in Kings having been forgotten. On page 272 we get yet another account—or rather two other accounts—in a delightfully self-contradictory sentence. "Ezekiel was the first to fix the feast of tabernacles on the fifteenth of the seventh month, xlv. 25, although the reference in 1 Kings xii. 32, if it is pre-exilic, would indicate that this date was already established in Judah." How Ezekiel could be the first to fix a date if it had been already established is not explained. Nor are we told how, if Ezekiel had been the first to fix a date which was already established, it was possible later for a post-exilic writer *now*, i. e., apparently, for the first time, to fix this exact date. As to the suggestion—if Dr. Kent really intends it—that 1 Kings xii. is not pre-exilic, it should be noticed what this implies. It means that somebody deliberately invented the whole story about Jeroboam's festival, well knowing that there was not a word of truth in it. It need scarcely be added that there is not a particle of foundation for any such position.

Some more instances may be taken from Dr. Kent's other remarks about Tabernacles on page 261: "At first it was apparently celebrated for only a day or two and at the local sanctuaries, cf. Judg. xxi. 19, 1 Sam. i. 3; but the Deuteronomic lawgivers extended it to a week and transferred it to the temple at Jerusalem. . . . Thus Solomon chose it for the dedication of his temple, 1 Kings viii. 2, 65." This passage contains more than one blunder. In the first place, "the local sanctuaries" is due to Dr. Kent's inability to distinguish between an altar and the House of the Lord. Both his references (Judges xxi. 19; 1 Sam. i. 3) are to Shiloh, the House where the Ark was situated, which, at the dates to which he

¹ Our *Italics*.

refers, was the religious capital of Israel. Secondly, when Dr. Kent says that Tabernacles "was *apparently* celebrated for only a day or two," he really means that there is no evidence at all to justify this idea, but that it is what he chooses to believe. Thirdly, when he writes that the Deuteronomic lawgivers *extended* it to a week, he is contradicting his own reference to 1 Kings viii. 65, which runs as follows: "So Solomon held the feast at that time, and all Israel with him, a great congregation from the entering in of Hamath unto the brook of Egypt, before the LORD our God, *seven days and seven days, even fourteen days.*" The extra days were due to the dedication, but it is abundantly clear that there was no room for anybody who lived after Solomon to extend the festival to seven days. And, fourthly, this chapter of Kings proves that a *transfer* to the Temple at Jerusalem would have been equally impossible for a lawgiver who lived subsequently to Solomon, inasmuch as in his days the festival was already celebrated there by all Israel "from the entering in of Hamath unto the brook of Egypt."

These examples have been taken almost at random, and could be multiplied indefinitely; but so many instances of Dr. Kent's unreliability in matters of fact will come before us in the course of this article that it is unnecessary to insist upon it further at this moment. We proceed to consider some of his other characteristics.

In the appendix at the end of the book there is something which Dr. Kent calls a "Selected Bibliography." The principles (if any) of the selection are not at all clear, but it is not with this matter that we would deal. One portion of the bibliography is headed "Other Ancient Codes." Now nobody who has any acquaintance with, for example, the Roman law, to which a number of the items in Dr. Kent's

bibliography relate, could believe, after reading his book, that he has studied these works. At one time we were of opinion that he might perhaps be acquainted with their covers: but a curious blunder affords some evidence that in one instance, at any rate, Dr. Kent has penetrated a portion of the title-page. There is an excellent edition of Justinian's Institutes, by Dr. Moyle, and Dr. Kent desired to include this in his "Selected Bibliography." The date he gives is 1890, which, though he does not say so, is the date of the *second* edition of the book. Our own copy belongs to the third edition, and the only copy of the second edition we have been able to consult is no longer in its original cover. But it is not likely that in a point of this kind there is any difference between the different editions. Now, on the cover, the third edition bears the legend "Imperatoris Justiniani Institutiones," but the title-page has the fuller inscription "Imperatoris Justiniani Institutionum Libri Quattuor." Dr. Kent, who either knows no Latin or else handles the language with the recklessness that characterizes his biblical work, appears to have looked at the title-page, and, finding the first three words of the title in larger type than the rest, seems to have thought them an adequate designation of the book. Accordingly he prints "Imperatoris Justiniani Institutionum," a *genitivus pendens*, which is neither Latin nor English.

However, whether or not that be the correct account of the appearance of this remarkable title in the "Selected Bibliography," we must point out that, corresponding to this portion "Other Ancient Codes," there are a number of sentences scattered about the book in which Dr. Kent appears to assume an acquaintance with legal literature which he does not possess. Thus he writes (Preface, p. vi): "Nowhere in all legal literature can the genesis and growth of primitive law

be traced so clearly as in Israel's codes thus restored." If and in so far as this may be intended to be a statement of fact, it is untrue, and would have been seen by Dr. Kent to be untrue had he taken the trouble to acquire some acquaintance with the literature relating to ancient law: if and in so far as it may be intended as an expression of opinion, it is unsound, and would have been recognized by the Doctor as unsound in the like event: if and in so far as it is intended to be a mere puff, comparable to the commendations that auctioneers bestow on the goods they sell, it is out of place in a book that should be scientific. In any case it inevitably produces a painful impression, which is deepened by such sentences as that which follows the one we have just quoted: "They [i. e. Israel's codes thus restored] also represent the most important corner-stones of our modern English laws and institutions and therefore challenge and richly reward the study of all legal and historical students." What exactly Dr. Kent may intend to convey when he calls something the corner-stone of a law or institution, we cannot pretend to know: but from his remark about all legal and historical students he apparently means that English law is in some way founded on the Hebrew codes. If this be his meaning, the statement is utterly false. The influence of the Pentateuchal legislation on English laws and institutions has been exceedingly slight.

Again, on page 12, we read: "In the light of these studies, and of analogies among other kindred peoples, it is thus possible to trace definitely the processes by which Israel's individual laws came into being." This sentence is almost true if it be read in the opposite sense to that intended by Dr. Kent. It is, in fact, the case that, in the light of legal studies and by the help of the comparative method, it is possible to go a long way towards tracing the origin and growth of Israelitish law:

but that origin and growth are entirely different from what Dr. Kent conceives them to have been. In point of fact, *legal studies render the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuchal legislation matter of scientific certainty*. A very good instance of the way in which the growth of the law is made plain by comparative legal studies is to be found in the law of homicide, and accordingly we shall deal with this in some detail later on; but for the moment we would draw attention to another result of Dr. Kent's lack of legal knowledge. It constantly happens that he fails to detect passages that are of importance in legal history. The plan of his book is to collect the relevant materials on each separate legal topic, but it is astonishing how seldom he succeeds in doing so. He deals with murder, but he omits the case of Cain, with its important instance of outlawry as the punishment; with rape, but Dinah and the blood feud, so well attested all the world over, may be sought in vain; with adultery, and he leaves out all the instances in Genesis; with theft, but Rachel's action and Benjamin's alleged offense have never occurred to him; with tithes, but he says nothing of Genesis xxviii. 22; with the instruction of children, but he does not notice Exodus xiii. 8, 14, 15—and so on almost *ad infinitum*.

After what has been said it will occasion no surprise if we add that, on reading the book, we have been led to think that in many cases Dr. Kent had not the vaguest understanding of the laws on which he professed to be commenting. This is the more obvious as, for some obscure reason, he has often printed his own paraphrase in the text in preference to a translation. Thus, on page 90, we find Leviticus v. 1 rendered as follows: "If any one sin when under oath as a witness by failing to give information concerning what he hath seen or known," etc. This is not a translation, nor does even Dr. Kent think

that it is, for he explains in his note that the literal meaning is "and heareth the voice of the oath, and is a witness whether he hath seen or known, if he do not give information," etc. To the present writer even this "literal" translation does not appear very satisfactory, for the word "oath" is inadequate, as a rendering of the Hebrew and the text means the voice of *an* "oath" (if that term be used): but it must be observed that the paraphrase entirely begs the question of the meaning of the text. There is an instance of an adjuration or curse—the verb corresponding to the Hebrew word Dr. Kent here translates "oath" is used—in Judges xvii. If, in that case, Micah had not confessed immediately, he would apparently have been within the language of Leviticus v. 1; but nobody could guess that from Dr. Kent's "translation," which, moreover, has the additional demerit of begging the further question whether witnesses were originally put on oath.

Another example of Dr. Kent's methods is to be found on page 174, where he renders Deuteronomy xvii. 8 thus: "If a case involving bloodshed or conflicting claims, or the plague of leprosy—subjects of dispute within thine own city—be too difficult for thee to decide"; and in his note he admits that the Hebrew means: "If there arise a case too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke." This is the more extraordinary, since, on page 88, he prints another version of the same text, which means something totally different from the rendering on page 174. It runs: "If a question involve bloodshed or conflicting claims, or the plague of leprosy,—questions of controversy within thy city too difficult for thee to decide,—then," etc. This means that no question involving any of the matters specified, however simple it might be, could be decided locally, and is as incompatible with his other trans-

lation as with the Hebrew text. In neither place does he offer any explanation whatever of the grounds for his paraphrase, including the strange reference to leprosy: though, on page 88, in dealing with the literal rendering, he speaks of "a stroke, like a plague, especially leprosy,"—whatever that may mean.

Perhaps this is a convenient place for mentioning another of Dr. Kent's extraordinary views. For Exodus xxxiii. 5 we read (p. 151): "So the Israelites despoiled themselves of their ornaments from Mount Horeb onward, *and with these Moses made a tent.*" It is a pity that Dr. Kent did not think fit to inform us by what process of alchemy Moses converted the ornaments into materials of which a tent could be constructed.

We shall notice but one more of Dr. Kent's strange characteristics—his neglect of those scholars with whom he does not agree. This by no means exhausts the list of his disqualifications: but their enumeration grows tedious. We are concerned to prove that his book is a masterpiece of worthlessness; but, once we have done that, the reasons for his incompetence are relatively unimportant, and accordingly we shall pass on at once to the task of dealing with the book in detail: yet it would be wrong not to call attention to the most glaring instance of his prejudice in this respect. There is, among modern students of the Pentateuch, one writer whose abilities place him far above the Wellhausens and the Kuenens, the Robertson Smiths and the Drivers—Professor A. Van Hoonacker of Louvain. This scholar has contributed two very important monographs on some of the subjects with which Dr. Kent has attempted to deal. They are: "Le Lieu du Culte dans la Législation rituelle des Hébreux" (1894), and "La Sacerdoce lévitique dans la Loi et dans L'Histoire des Hébreux" (1900). We cannot find that Dr. Kent so much as claims to have heard of the earlier work, a careful study of which might

have saved him from many bad blunders. The second he mentions in his "Selected Bibliography": but he does not say that he has even looked inside the book. We have failed to find any references to it even in those portions of his work where we should most expect them: and, in view of his behavior with regard to legal literature, the presence of a name in his "Selected Bibliography" cannot be held to raise any presumption that Dr. Kent is acquainted with the contents of the book.

Dr. Kent's volume is composed of introduction, annotated texts, and appendices. The rest of this article will be devoted, first, to dealing with the annotated texts; and, secondly, to some remarks on some of the general questions raised by the introduction. As the constant exposure of blunders grows wearisome, the course adopted will be to deal in some detail with the first division, which is headed "Personal and Family Laws" (omitting, however, minor blunders), and then to make a selection of important blunders from the rest of the book.

II.

On page 51, "Israel's primitive laws," we read, "contain no references to the king or state or even to judges." How has Dr. Kent enabled himself to make this statement? (1) He has altered Exodus xxi. 22, to omit the reference to the judges (p. 117). (2) He has ignored Exodus xxii. 28b, which he translates (p. 79): "Thou shalt not curse a ruler of thy people," adding a note that "Evidently in the mind of the primitive lawgiver the civil rulers are regarded as the earthly representatives of the divine King." It is difficult to understand how he would reconcile a reference to civil rulers with the statement that there is no reference to the state. (3) He has ignored Exodus xviii. 13 ff., which, on page 86, he heads

"Primitive Codes," and presumably attributes to the author or authors of "Israel's primitive laws." (4) In Exodus xxi. 6 he translates *Elohim* by "God," and refers it to "the family gods or penates placed in early times beside the door" (p. 62) ! and (5) in Exodus xxii. 7 (8) he again renders *Elohim* by "God," and explains it of the sacred oracle used by a priest at "one of the sanctuaries" (p. 69). With regard to these two latter points we would venture to quote what we have said elsewhere in reference to Exodus xxi.

"The first remark which occurs is that, whatever may have been the origin of the Pentateuch, this law at present stands in a book that admittedly prohibits both images and the worship of all powers save One, and was placed and retained in its present position by a man or men who believed absolutely in those two doctrines. If this law is Mosaic—and the evidence for the authenticity of the whole of the Mosaic legislation is overwhelming—*cadit quaestio*. But on the critical assumption the case is not less strong: for it must be remembered that all the supposititious editors who dealt with this passage were monotheists, and had absolutely no scruples about garbling or cutting out anything they disliked. It follows that they, at any rate, did not take this view of the meaning.

"Secondly, the word *Elohim* occurs elsewhere in a legal passage (Ex. xxii. 7 and 8 (E. V. 8 and 9)). Does Mr. Addis believe that certain cases of theft were tried by the spirit of the doorpost? Kautzsch alleges that in this passage and in 1 Sam. ii. 25 *Elohim* 'has no other sense than that of "Deity."' We shall deal with the passage from Samuel immediately, but does this writer believe that God tried cases of theft either in Person or by means of an image? And if so, what was the procedure?

"Thirdly, this theory involves making Eli say to his sons (1 Sam. ii. 25): 'If a man trespass against a man, the spirit of a doorpost [or, according to Kautzsch, "God"—Hebrew *Elohim*] shall judge him; but if a man trespass against the Lord, who shall intercede for him?' It is true that one critic,—the late Dr. Kuenen,—with characteristic indifference to the known facts, wished to translate *Elohim* in this passage by 'God,'¹ and understand it of the oracles of the various sanctuaries'; but (a) this rests on the confusion implied in the word 'sanctuaries,' (b) we know that the great majority of

¹ Religion of Israel, E. T., vol. II. p. 84.

cases were, in fact, tried by the elders,¹ and (c) justice was administered in the gates" (Notes on Hebrew Religion, pp. 24-25).

Sect. 1. *Honor and Obedience Due Parents*.—Dr. Kent here sets out Ex. xxi. 15, 17; Deut. v. 16; xxi. 18-21; xxvii. 16; Lev. xix. 3a; xx. 9, and in his note he writes: "Semitic law never went as far as the Roman, which gave to the father absolute power of life and death over his children." In point of fact, we meet with the absolute power of life and death more than once in the book of Genesis. The case of Abraham and Isaac may be set aside, for it may perhaps be argued that the divine command makes it impossible to generalize from that case, but there are other instances. The strongest is Reuben's "Slay my two sons, if I bring him not to thee" (xlii. 37). This power apparently extended over *all* members of the household. Thus Judah without any trial orders that Tamar shall be burnt (xxxviii. 24), and Jacob says to Laban, "With whomsoever thou findest thy gods, he shall not live" (xxxix. 32). Dr. Kent ignores all these passages. Parallels to this are to be found in abundance all the world over. (See Post Grundriss der ethnologischen Jurisprudenz, vol. i. pp. 170-173; ii. 135.) In Israel, as elsewhere, the course of legal his-

¹Kuenen (*op. cit.*, vol. ii. p. 83) supposes that some exceptional cases were outside the jurisdiction of the ordinary judge, and accounts in this way for Exodus xxii., but this breaks down when applied to Eli's speech. It is untrue that all transgressions against men, however serious, were judged by the priest. Nor does Eli's speech in any way suggest exceptional circumstances. In point of fact, the ordinary criminal justice of the country was not administered either by "God," or an image, or an oracle, or even the spirit of a doorpost. For example, we have an account of the trial of one Naboth (1 Kings xxi.), which has not received the attention it deserves. The account is also valuable because it shows the Deuteronomic law of evidence (two witnesses) and the Levitical law of blasphemy in operation before the dates to which Deuteronomy and Leviticus are assigned by the critics.

tory ran parallel to the development of the Roman rule, as to which see Moyle on Justinian Institutes, bk. i. tit. 9. It is clear that in the days of Moses the paternal power had to some extent undergone limitation by custom, for Exodus xxi. 15 and 17, as well as Deuteronomy xxi. 18-21 and Leviticus xx. 9, imply that the death penalty was executed in the case of offenses against the parents only after trial before the ordinary courts, and not in the exercise of domestic jurisdiction. On the other hand, the custom of sacrificing children appears to have endured to a late period (see, e. g., Jer. xix. 5), without being subjected to the jurisdiction of the courts.

Sect. 3. *Relatives between whom Marriage is Illegitimate.*—This need not be discussed in detail; but it should be noticed that Dr. Kent omits all reference to the case of Reuben (Gen. xxxv. 22; xlix. 4).

Sect. 4. *Marriage with a Captive*, Deut. xxi. 10-14.—Dr. Kent here writes: "The Babylonian law also made the same provisions regarding female slaves, if they had borne children to the master." His reference is to Hammurabi, sect. 137. In point of fact, the provisions are different, and the cases to which they apply are also different. Deuteronomy deals with a captive, Hammurabi with a woman who has brought a marriage portion, and who therefore cannot have been a captive in war. Deuteronomy provides that her husband is to let her go free if he has no delight in her, whilst Hammurabi only contemplates the case of a woman who has borne children, and enacts that until they are grown up she is not to be free to go where she will. There are also other differences, but enough has been said to show that there is no justification at all for Dr. Kent's statement.

Sect. 7. *Marriage after Seduction*, Ex. xxii. 15 (16); Deut. xxii. 28.—We have here a very bad mistake: Deuteronomy

deals with a form of rape, Exodus with seduction: but Dr. Kent has confused the two here and again in sect. 87. (See, further, *Studies in Biblical Law*, pp. 23-25.)

Sect. 12. *Rights of Hired Servants.*—Exodus xii. 45 and Leviticus xxv. 40 are here omitted without explanation.

Sects. 13-21.—A group of sections relating to *slaves*. It will be convenient here simply to point out the main blunders and give references, as they have mostly been exposed time after time. (1) Dr. Kent is wholly unable to distinguish between a slave and an insolvent freeman falling into bondage through poverty. (See *Studies in Biblical Law*, pp. 5-11.) (2) As before mentioned, Dr. Kent mistranslates *Elohim* in Exodus xxi. 6 as "God." (3) He is also quite ignorant of the numerous ways in which slavery originated in Hebrew antiquity (and indeed in almost all early communities),¹ and omits the passages in Genesis that bear on the subject. (4) He further omits from his discussion of the religious position of slaves the fundamental commands of Genesis xvii. 12-14.

Sect. 22. *Rights and Duties of Resident Aliens.*—Numbers xxxv. 15 and Leviticus xxiv. 10-23 (which latter is legally by far the most interesting and important of the passages relating to aliens) are omitted without a word of explanation. (See *Studies in Biblical Law*, pp. 84-94.) It is clear from sect. 62 that Dr. Kent has not the slightest comprehension of the case of Shelomith's son in Leviticus xxiv.

Sect. 27. *Conveyance of Real Property.*—Dr. Kent writes: "There is no evidence that, in the long period preceding Nehemiah, the law of the year of jubilee, which provided that all land should revert to its hereditary owners, was known; and the proof that it was not in force is conclusive." The

¹ Birth, crime, insolvency, kidnapping, capture—or slaves could be acquired from others by purchase or gift.

proof that it was known is contained in Ezekiel vii. 12, 13; xli. 16-17, and an examination of these passages shows that it was in force. (See, further, *Studies in Biblical Law*, pp. 94-99; Churchman,¹ May, 1906, pp. 282-293.) Dr. Kent's statements are the more remarkable as, on pages 132-133, he contradicts what he has here written: "The earliest allusion, however, in the O. T. to any such institution, is found in Ezek. xli. 17, where land given by the prince is to revert to him *in the year of release*. Whether the prophet refers to an already established institution or possibly here gives a suggestion which was later developed into the law of the year of jubilee cannot be definitely determined. On the whole, the exile, with its changed conditions, inspiring new regulations and experiments, as Ezekiel's elaborate program testifies, appears to furnish the background and date of the law of the year of jubilee." This is rather strange after the "no evidence" and "conclusive proof" of the earlier passage.

Sect. 30. *The Law of Primogeniture*.—Dr. Kent begins with Deuteronomy xxi. 15-17, but omits to notice the classical instance of the first-born son of a less loved wife being postponed to the son of the better loved wife (Gen. xlviii. 22; xlix. 4; 1 Chron. v. 1-2), where, however, there was other justification. He also leaves out the other passage in Genesis (xxv. 5, 6) which, together with these texts, gives us the historical background of this law, showing that among the ancient Hebrews the father had some power of disposing of his goods among his children in his lifetime in such a way as to prevent equality. Then he proceeds to write: "This law was disregarded by David, who appointed Solomon as his successor, even though he was not his oldest son, 1 Kings i.

¹ The Churchman, edited by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. London: Elliott Stock.

11-13." We have here a confusion between sovereignty and succession to movable property. The law of course had no reference at all to the former.

Sect. 31. *Rights of Daughters to Inherit.*—Dr. Kent here asserts: "It was only in the latest period of O. T. history that daughters were recognized as legal heirs." (For proof that this law is Mosaic, see *Studies in Biblical Law*, pp. 98-99; Churchman, May, 1906, pp. 287-289.) On the preceding page Dr. Kent writes: "In the earlier times the property passed to the male heirs, and upon them devolved the obligation to support the mother and the unmarried sisters. If there were no sons, the father's brothers assumed the duties of parents and inherited the property of the deceased." This is pure fiction. The earliest evidence is to the effect that in default of sons a slave could inherit, to the exclusion of the collateral relations (Gen. xv. 2-4).

This completes our survey of the main blunders made by Dr. Kent in his first division (pp. 51-74). We have here dealt with this simply because it stood first. The other divisions are equally bad. We proceed to deal with some other topics.

The division of booty has provided Dr. Kent with an opportunity to display his inability to discriminate between different sets of facts. On page 12 he writes: "In 1 Samuel xxx. 24, 25, for instance, there is a most instructive example showing that the law regarding the distribution of booty, which Numbers xxxi. 27 attributes to Moses, first arose as the result of a decision given by David after an expedition against the Amalekites." The facts—and consequently the decisions—in the two cases are wholly dissimilar. In Samuel the question was whether men who had started on an expedition but had been overcome by exhaustion on the road were entitled to

share in the spoils. David determined that they were; and accordingly they shared equally with the others, each man receiving the same benefit whether he had been compelled to stay behind or not. In Numbers a division is ordered not between various portions of the expeditionary force, but between that force on the one hand and the congregation on the other. The booty is to be divided into two halves: and it is obvious that each of the members of the congregation would as a result receive a very different quantity from that which fell to each member of the fighting force. So that in reality we have different facts giving rise to different rules and consequently to different results. There is really nothing technical about the matter: and any clear-headed layman who had taken the trouble to read the relevant passages carefully must have avoided Dr. Kent's blunder.

On pages 149-150 Dr. Kent repeats once more some of the blunders about the Ark that we have recently exposed elsewhere (see Notes on Hebrew Religion, pp. 28-31), and we shall therefore not linger on this topic, except to point out that Dr. Kent alters the biblical text without so much as hinting that he has done so; for in Numbers x. 33 he omits the expression "the covenant of," and does not even say that this is present in the original.

We now come to a group of questions relating to places of sacrifice that we would gladly pass over, because we have so often exposed the blunders of the Wellhausen school in this respect: but recent correspondence with an eminent critic has satisfied us that it is still necessary to emphasize and elaborate the true position in regard to these matters.

1. On page 211 Dr. Kent writes: "Until the Deuteronomic code was promulgated, apparently every animal killed for food was slaughtered at some local sanctuary" (cf. p. 213). This

is untrue. Non-sacrificial slaughter is mentioned or contemplated in each of the following passages: Gen. xviii. 7; xxvii. 9-14; xliii. 16; Ex. xxi. 37 (xxii. 1); 1 Sam. xxv. 11; xxviii. 24; 1 Kings xix. 21. Moreover, in Judges vi. 19, Gideon "made ready a kid." This, together with some broth (and other gifts), was subsequently burnt as a sacrifice. Had it been true that all slaughter was at that time sacrificial, both the kid and the animal from which the broth was made must have been sacrificed *twice over*, once when they were killed and once when they were consumed by fire.

2. Dr. Kent entirely misunderstands Exodus xx. 24 (p. 158). He believes that it refers to "every place where I cause My Name to be remembered," and interprets this as referring to "sacred places," where God "had revealed Himself." The historical instances prove beyond all possibility of doubt that this is wrong. There is no revelation in 1 Samuel xiv. 33-35 (Saul's altar after Michmash). The house of Jesse had a family sacrifice (1 Sam. xx. 6, etc.). This involves the use of an altar, but again no special revelation can be suggested. And the same remark applies to Adonijah's stone (1 Kings i. 9) and Naaman's earth (2 Kings v. 17). The law clearly authorizes lay sacrifice for certain limited purposes at *altars* (not houses) of earth or stone in "all the place where I cause My Name to be remembered," i. e. (after the desert age) in the land of Canaan.¹

¹The Hebrew is usually translated "in every place," but may at least equally well be rendered "in all the place." (See, for a linguistic discussion, S. Leathes, *The Law in the Prophets*, pp. 290-292.) That this was the meaning attached to the law in pre-exilic times appears clearly from Naaman's requiring *Canaanitish* earth to be able to sacrifice to God (2 Kings v. 17) (a passage that also proves that a plurality of lay altars on Canaanitish soil was regarded as lawful by Elisha). So, too, 1 Samuel xxvi. 19, "Go, serve other gods," shows that it was held that sacrifice could be performed to Israel's God only

3. Dr. Kent of course omits the passages which prove that side by side with these lay altars the legislator of Exodus recognized a House of the Lord whither all Israel were to repair three times a year: "Thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, of the *bikkurim* [a kind of first-fruits] of wheat harvest. . . . The first of the *bikkurim* of thy ground thou shalt bring into the House of the LORD thy God" (Ex. xxxiv.). ". . . and the feast of harvest, the *bikkurim* of thy labours, of that which thou sowest in the field. . . . The first of the *bikkurim* of thy ground thou shalt bring into the House of the LORD thy God" (Ex. xxiii.). It is abundantly clear that if *bikkurim* are offered at the House and on the feast of weeks, the feast of weeks must have been celebrated at the House. Further, these texts are coupled with commands that all males shall appear before God three times in the year, and weeks was one of the three. It follows that the other two "appearances" must have been similar to the "appearance" on weeks, and must therefore have taken place at the House.

4. Dr. Kent has never realized that the plurality of lay altars sanctioned by Exodus is further recognized in Deuteronomy xvi. 21.

These remarks completely dispose of the whole of Dr. Kent's ideas about "sanctuaries"; and, as the blunders have already been exposed so frequently and in so much detail, we need not linger: but in passing from the subject we may notice one omission of some importance. The lay altars were entirely different in materials, form, and appearance from the altars of burnt offering of Tabernacle and Temple or the altars of heathen high places. It is only necessary to contrast the data as to the latter class with the descriptions of Saul's Michmash in his land (cf. Hos. ix. 4), though, of course, he could be worshiped by vow and prayer all the world over (2 Sam. xv. 7-12, etc.). As to Isalah xix., see Studies in Biblical Law, pp. 81-82.

altar, Elijah's erection on Carmel, and the altars used by Moses, Joshua, etc., in order to see this. Now in 1 Kings i. 50; ii. 28 (i. e. before the erection of the Temple), we find the *horns* of an altar mentioned. This could not have been an altar of the lay type, because a stone or mound could have no horns. Even omitting the testimony of Chronicles, it follows that at that date there was before the Ark an altar conforming to the type laid down in Exodus xxvii., side by side with the lay altars so frequently met with in that period.

On pages 172 f., Dr. Kent sketches the origin of the priesthood in Israel, but he quite forgets to notice the passages relating to Eli. Accordingly we read: "Hebrew history furnishes many suggestions regarding the origin of the priesthood. . . . In time, however, the ceremonial and other restrictions placed upon the chief priest of the nation limited the free exercise of the kingly functions. Among some early peoples the chief ruler was shorn of all real military and civil power, and became only the head of the national cult. Other kings, like David and Solomon, appointed certain royal priests and conferred upon them the priestly functions which originally belonged to the head of the nation," etc. Even when the whole of the supposed priestly sections of the Pentateuch are wiped out, it is clear from Samuel that the priesthood was older than the monarchy; while Deuteronomy x. 6 and the story in Judges xvii. and xviii. prove that, long before the monarchy came into existence, the priestly character of the house of Aaron and of the Levites was well recognized. But there appears to be another confusion in Dr. Kent's mind, which has probably something to do with his theories of the priestly origin. He apparently believes that the individual sacrifices were slain by *priests* in the supposititious priestly code. Thus he writes (p. 174): "The story of the young

Levite, who was employed by Micah the Ephraimite, Judg. xvii. 18, as well as the references in 1 Sam. to the activity of Eli and his sons, would seem to indicate that originally the sons of Levi were simply the guardians of the sacred objects like the Ark and the Urim and Thummim and, later, of the local shrines; and that the sacrifices were slain by the individual offerers," etc. He need go no further than the fifth verse of Leviticus i. to discover that the sacrifices were slain by the individual offerers even in "P."

Sect. 150.—Dr. Kent here prints Deuteronomy xviii. 1a and 2 under the misleading title "Prohibition against the Levites Holding Property." He of course omits "the patrimony" of xviii. 8, which proves that this view of the passage is impossible, and proceeds to add the following: "This law was doubtless intended to anticipate exactions by the priestly judges and to prevent the alienation of temple property for private ends." There are many reasons why this is impossible: but, in addition to the reference just given, it will be sufficient to point out that the passage in no wise prohibits the acquisition—or the alienation—of any form of property, movable or immovable, by the Levites. It is, however, characteristic that in the very next section Dr. Kent prints xviii. 8, and admits that it implies family possessions.

Object of Cities of Refuge, sect. 53, and *Murder*, sect. 83.—On this topic the biblical information is fairly complete, and it is possible to trace the history of the law in the light of the comparative material. The first stage known to us is presented by the history of Cain, which Dr. Kent does not notice. This presents us with an institution found in many ancient societies—the Roman *sacratio capitis*, and see Post Grundriss, vol. i. pp. 163 ff., 352 ff., on *Friedloslegung*. The offender is expelled from the tribal community, and left to wander over

the earth a vagabond liable to death at the hands of any who may meet him. Next comes Genesis ix. 6, laying down the law of blood revenge. But it must be observed that in this passage no distinction is made between various forms of homicide. *All* taking of human life pardonable or unpardonable falls within the terms of the verse. (Cf. *Post Grundriss*, vol. i. pp. 237 f.; vol. ii. p. 333.)

The next stage is one of singular human interest, for it stands in close relation to an incident in the life of the great lawgiver. Moses once slew a man, not in enmity or having lain in wait. God appointed him a place whither he might flee and live, and there he remained until the death of Pharaoh. All this is very vividly mirrored in the Mosaic law of homicide. A distinction is for the first time drawn between wilful murder and manslaughter, and places are appointed for the protection of those who had committed the latter offense, while the rôle of Pharaoh is assigned to the chief hereditary office-bearer of the Mosaic theocracy—the high priest. Similar institutions meet us elsewhere, but it would fall beyond the scope of this article to discuss them, or to point out the statesmanship with which the provisions of this law are nicely adjusted to fit in with, and yet neutralize, the prevailing sentiment of blood revenge. But attention must be drawn to the terms in which the distinction is laid down. Being entirely new, the principle of dividing homicide could only be made clear to the people with difficulty. The human mind, especially in early times, apprehends the concrete far more readily than the abstract. Hence, as in other archaic legislations, we find a number of concrete cases laid down: and this has led a comparative jurist like Dareste to express the opinion that Numbers xxxv. is the most *archaic* portion of the Pentateuchal legislation (*Études D'Histoire du Droit*, pp. 28–29, note; cf. p. 23). To the

present writer this review appears to need some qualification. Thus the extraordinary simile in Deuteronomy xxii. 26 (a ravished maiden compared to a murdered man) shows that it was equally difficult for Moses to convey to the mind of his people the idea of compulsion as affecting criminal liability; but undoubtedly Dareste's view of the passage is in the main sound.

We must now turn to another feature of the development. In archaic law many offenses that are treated in a mature system as crimes, i. e. as offenses punishable by the state, are viewed from an entirely different standpoint. The desire of the early legislator is to restrain and regulate the sentiment of revenge, and set bounds to the activities of injured persons who strive to exact reparation in ways that are not beneficial to the community. In the case of homicide we see that in the Mosaic age it was treated as matter for private feud: but side by side with this there is another idea growing up. In Numbers xxxv. we find it laid down that blood polluteth the land, and the Israelites are commanded not to defile the land which they inhabit, in the midst of which God dwells. This idea finds further expression in Deuteronomy: "Thou shalt *put away the innocent blood from Israel*, that it may go well with thee" (xix. 13); "Forgive, O LORD, *thy people Israel*, . . . and *suffer not innocent blood* [to remain] *in the midst of thy people Israel*. And the blood shall be forgiven *them*," etc. (xxi. 8). We have here expressions of the sense that the community in its corporate capacity has some responsibility for the prevention of crime, that murder is no longer merely the affair of the deceased's family. And our materials take us yet one step further. When the monarchy arose we find that the king, as the highest organ of the state, began to feel that it was his duty to punish murderers, and that, if he failed in that, blood-

guiltiness would rest on him. This idea finds expression in David's language in 2 Samuel iii. 28 f. (perhaps, too, in iv. 1) and xiv. 9, and most clearly in 1 Kings ii. 31-33.

Now what does Dr. Kent make of all this? The case of Cain he omits, and of course he does not notice the passages from Samuel and Kings. He transcribes Genesis ix. 5-6, but obviously without any comprehension of the meaning: and he knows nothing of the growth of the sense of corporate responsibility. But he places Genesis ix. 5-6 between Exodus, Deuteronomy, and Leviticus on the one hand, and Numbers xxxv. on the other. It is only too evident that he has not devoted any thought to the curious doctrines as to the history of the law that are involved in sandwiching a passage that does not distinguish the various classes of homicide between others that do.

On page 233 Dr. Kent deals with Exodus xxx. 11-16. He writes: "According to Neh. x. 33 the annual temple tax consisted of one-third of a shekel. The present law evidently comes from a period later than the great reformation of 400 B. C." "The present law," it should be observed, contemplates something which is neither annual nor a tax. On the taking of the census—which was *never* an annual performance—each Israelite was to give a ransom for his life, "that there be no plague among them, when thou numberest them." This idea should probably be brought into connection with the narrative of David's census (2 Sam. xxiv.), but, whether that be so or not, the underlying motive is palpably different from that expressed in Nehemiah; and a ransom paid on a single occasion is absolutely unlike an annually recurring payment.

We shall close this section of the article with a consideration of Dr. Kent's treatment of the law relating to first-fruits (pp. 229-231).

The Pentateuch has two different terms, *reshith* and *bikkurim*, both of which are usually rendered "first-fruits," though in the Revised Version the latter is sometimes translated "first-ripe fruits." It has been questioned whether these two terms express the same or different things: but when the legal evidence is closely examined no doubt is possible. *Reshith* is by far the wider word: it is used of oil, wine, corn, wool, fruits of the ground, honey, leaven, and dough or meal—the exact meaning of the Hebrew word is disputed (Num. xviii. 12; Deut. xviii. 4; xxvi. 2–10; Lev. ii. 11–12; Num. xv. 17–21). Apparently the fundamental law relating to it is to be found in Exodus xxii. 28 (29), which provides that "thy fullness and thy tear thou shalt not delay," rendered by R. V.: "Thou shalt not delay [to offer of] the abundance of thy fruits and thy liquors." *Bikkurim*, on the other hand, in the Pentateuchal legislation, appears to be confined to things that are sown, especially wheat (Ex. xxiii. 16, 19; xxxiv. 22, 26; Lev. ii. 14; xxiii. 20). Certainly it is not wide enough to satisfy the requirements of Exodus xxii., where the language used ("thy fullness and *thy tear*") clearly points to liquids such as oil and wine. But there are other points of difference. In the case of each offering we have one dated ceremony, and *the dates are seven weeks apart*. A sheaf or omer—again the meaning of the Hebrew is doubtful—of *reshith* of corn was to be waved on "the morrow after the sabbath" (Lev. xxiii. 9–14), and seven weeks later the feast of weeks was to be celebrated, when bread of *bikkurim* was offered (Lev. xxiii. 20). This is in harmony with the fact that the feast of weeks is frequently associated with *bikkurim*, and is even called "the day of the *bikkurim*" in one place (Num. xxviii. 26). Further, even when *reshith* of cereals was offered, it is clear that the method of preparation was different. Thus in Leviticus xxiii.

the national offering of *reshith* consists of corn, but the offering of *bikkurim* takes the form of bread. This distinction reappears in Leviticus ii. 11-16, from which it is clear that individual offerings were differently presented, *reshith* not coming up on the altar nor being technically a meal-offering, while *bikkurim* of corn were presented parched and bruised with oil and frankincense, and constituted a meal-offering, part of which was burnt as an offering made by fire.

Dr. Kent, of course, knows nothing of these distinctions, and does not appear to have given the matter a moment's thought. To him *reshith* and *bikkurim* are alike first-fruits, and he does not even mention the fact that different words are used in the Hebrew. As usual, too, a whole host of important passages are omitted from his section on the subject (e. g. Ex. xxii. 28 (29); Num. xviii. 12, 13; Lev. xxiii. 12-20), while he includes Leviticus xix. 24, which has no bearing on first-fruits. Further we were led to suspect that Dr. Kent had no notion that any of the passages related to national offerings; but, as he was silent on the subject, we had no proof till we reached page 246, where, in defiance of Leviticus xxiii. 9-20, as well as Numbers xxviii., xxix.; 1 Kings xviii. 29; 2 Kings xvi. 15, and others passages, he calmly writes: "The public sacrifices consisted simply of burnt- and sin-offerings, with occasional peace-offerings"!

The exposure of blunders like these on nearly every page of the commentary might be continued almost indefinitely: but we apprehend that we have said enough to make clear beyond all possibility of doubt the true character of the work before us.

III.

We cannot attempt in the space at our disposal to deal with the introduction in any detail. Nor is this necessary, for it is largely based on the blunders expressed in the body of the

volume, and it everywhere displays the boundless incompetence and recklessness that we have already noticed. To illustrate: on page 14 we find Dr. Kent's confusion as to the place of sacrifice paraded to prove that the Pentateuchal legislation is composite. On page 18 we read: "The permission to build altars and offer sacrifices at many different places (Ex. xx. 24-25) suggests either greater antiquity than even Exodus xxxiv. 26, or else the less restricted usage of Northern Israel"—a passage that (apart from other faults) is written in obvious disregard or oblivion of the fact that Exodus xxiii. 19 (attributed to the *same* "code" as Exodus xx. 24-25) is identical with Exodus xxxiv. 26. On page 25 we find the following astounding sentence written in reference to Exodus xxi. 1-xxii. 20 and the code of Hammurabi: "Both codes seek only to guard against crimes and to anticipate the more common cases of dispute, and thus to establish principles and precedents to guide judges in deciding similar questions." Whatever Dr. Kent may mean by "crimes," the statement is wholly false as regards both "codes." If he would read Exodus xxi. 2 ff.—the first law in the supposed "code" to which it belongs—he would discover that it was promulgated neither to guard against "crimes" nor "to anticipate the more common cases of dispute," but for the benefit of Hebrew slaves who had been sold to fresh masters. As to Hammurabi, many of the provisions relating to royal officers—to take the first instance that occurs to us—are enacted for the benefit of the king, and not for the reasons supposed by Dr. Kent. But the sentence is shockingly erroneous in other respects. The primary object of every jurial law is to furnish a rule to be applied in cases falling within it, not "to establish principles and precedents to guide judges in deciding *similar* questions." Moreover, as with rare exceptions the jurisdiction of courts

can be invoked only where an offense has been committed or a dispute has arisen, the naïveté of the sentence, apart from its blunders, shows that Dr. Kent has no conception of what a law is.

We have shown so fully that there is no topic related to Hebrew (or any other) law on which Dr. Kent is qualified either by his abilities or by his attainments or by his methods to express any opinion whatever, that we should be prepared to close this review here: but the intrinsic interest and importance of the questions handled tempt us to touch upon some of them.

To undertake to tackle any question of Israelitish law without legal training, and access to the comparative material, is like attempting to demolish a first-class modern fortress with no more potent weapon than a pea-shooter. We shall endeavor just to outline the methods in which these may be applied to one or two selected topics.

The Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuchal legislation being disputed, we may ask what the comparative method has to teach us on the subject. And, first, as to the topics of jural law that are treated. Dr. Kent has dared to include in his "Selected Bibliography" Maine's "Ancient Law," a world-famous book, of the contents of which our author is phenomenally ignorant. We extract from it a passage that was written as the result of an inductive study of several ancient legislations, but *without reference to the Pentateuch*.

"Nine-tenths of the civil part of the law practised by civilised societies are made up of the Law of Persons, of the Law of Property and of Inheritance, and of the Law of Contract. But it is plain that all these provinces of jurisprudence must shrink within narrower boundaries, the nearer we make our approaches to the infancy of social brotherhood. The Law of Persons, which is nothing else than the Law of Status, will be restricted to the scantiest limits as long as all forms of status are merged in common subjection to Paternal Power, as long as the Wife has no rights against her Husband, the Son none

against his Father, and the Infant Ward none against the Agnates who are his Guardians. Similarly, the rules relating to Property and Succession can never be plentiful, so long as land and goods devolve within the family, and, if distributed at all, are distributed inside its circle. But the greatest gap in ancient civil law will always be caused by the absence of Contract, which some archaic codes do not mention at all, while others significantly attest the immaturity of the moral notions on which Contract depends by supplying its place with an elaborate jurisprudence of Oaths. There are no corresponding reasons for the poverty of penal law, and accordingly, even if it be hazardous to pronounce that the childhood of nations is always a period of ungoverned violence, we shall still be able to understand why the modern relation of criminal law to civil should be inverted in ancient codes" (*Ancient Law*, pp. 368-369).

Let this passage be carefully considered, for every word of it is true of the Mosaic legislation. The commonest cases of property in and succession to land are treated in Leviticus xxv., and the case of Zelophehad's daughters—of course regarded as late by Dr. Kent and his compeers. "The immaturity of the moral notions on which Contract depends" is attested not merely by an "elaborate jurisprudence of oaths" (Num. xxx.), but perhaps even more significantly by such scanty contract law as exists. The perpetual dependence on religion, and not on the power of the courts, in such matters as the position of hired servants and pledge, affords the best evidence of the archaic conditions for which the legislation is designed. In the light of these facts—and others like them—Dr. Kent's dictum as to Exodus xxi. 1-xxii. 20 may be read with amusement: "A study of the Hebrew code in the light of the needs of early Hebrew society, leads to the conclusion that it is not a fragment of a large code, but that the early code, with the probable exception of five laws, is preserved in its original and complete form"! (p. 25).

But, after all, the Pentateuch does not present us with jural laws standing alone. They are involved with precepts of a

different nature. What 'have the comparative materials to teach us on this head?

"There is no system of recorded law, literally from China to Peru, which, when it first emerges into notice, is not seen to be entangled with religious ritual and observance. The law of the Romans has been thought to be that in which the civil and Pontifical jurisprudence were earliest and most completely disentangled. Yet the meagre extant fragments of the Twelve Tables of Rome contain rules which are plainly religious or ritualistic:—

"Thou shalt not square a funeral pile with an adze.

Let not women tear their cheeks at a funeral.

Thou shalt not put gold on a corpse."

Maine, *Early Law and Custom*, pp. 5-6.

A careful study of the extant fragments of the Roman Twelve Tables, we may remark in passing, would have led Dr. Kent to omit or materially to modify his comments on the form of the Pentateuchal legislation, just as a perusal of the first chapter of Maine's "*Ancient Law*" would have prevented his writing about the word "judgments" in the Pentateuch and Hammurabi in the way he has done (p. 23).

But it is easy to provide many other parallels which not only make for the antiquity of the Mosaic legislation but also destroy the notions as to the relation of Israel and Babylon for which Dr. Kent's manifest ignorance is responsible. Thus he writes (pp. 47-48): "The distinctions between clean and unclean food, and the laws of ceremonial purity were shared in common." In so far as this dictum is true it may be paralleled from any good book on archaic religion. We may quote a sentence of Maine's as to the early Hindu law-books: "They contain much more ritual than law, a great deal more about the impurity caused by touching impure things than about crime, a great deal more about penalties than about punishments" (*Early Law and Custom*, p. 18). The following extracts from Darmesteter's introduction to the *Zendavesta* are particularly apposite:—

"The first object of man is purity, *yaozdan*: 'purity is for man, next to life, the greatest good.'

"Purity and impurity have not in the *Vendîdâd* the exclusively spiritual meaning which they have in our languages: they do not refer to an inward state of the person, but chiefly to a physical state of the body. Impurity or uncleanness may be described as the state of a person or thing that is possessed of the demon; and the object of purification is to expel the demon.

"The principal means by which uncleanness enters man is death, as death is the triumph of the demon.

"When a man dies, as soon as the soul has parted from the body, the *Drug Nasu* or *Corpse-Drug* falls upon the dead from the regions of hell, and whoever thenceforth touches the corpse becomes unclean, and makes unclean whomsoever he touches" (*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. iv. pp. lxxxv f.).

"Not only real death makes one unclean, but partial death too. Everything that goes out of the body of man is dead, and becomes the property of the demon. The going breath is unclean, it is forbidden to blow the fire with it, and even to approach the fire without screening it from the contagion. . . . Parings of nails and cuttings or shavings of hair are unclean, and become weapons in the hands of the demons unless they have been protected by certain rites and spells. Any phenomenon by which the bodily nature is altered, whether accompanied with danger to health or not, was viewed as a work of the demon, and made the person unclean in whom it took place. One of these phenomena, which is a special object of attention in the *Vendîdâd*, is the uncleanness of women during their menses. The menses are sent by *Ahriman*, especially when they last beyond the usual time: therefore a woman, as long as they last, is unclean and possessed of the demon: she must be kept confined, apart from the faithful whom her touch would defile, and from the fire which her very look would injure; she is not allowed to eat as much as she wishes, as the strength she might acquire would accrue to the fiends. Her food is not given to her from hand to hand, but is passed to her from a distance, in a long leaden spoon. *The origin of all these notions is in certain physical instincts, in physiological psychology, which is the reason why they are found among peoples very far removed from one another by race or religion.*¹ But they took in Persia a new meaning as they were made a logical part of the whole religious system.

"A woman that has been just delivered of a child is also unclean, although it would seem that she ought to be considered pure amongst the pure, since life has been increased by her in the world, and she has enlarged the realm of *Ormazd*. But the strength of old instincts overcame the drift of new principles. . . .

¹ Our Italics.

"Logic required that the sick man should be treated as an unclean one, that is, as one possessed. Sickness, being sent by Ahriman, ought to be cured like all his other works, by washings and spells. In fact, the medicine of spells was considered the most powerful of all, and although it did not oust the medicine of the lancet and that of drugs, yet it was more highly esteemed and less mistrusted. The commentator on the Vendidad very sensibly observes that if it does not relieve, it will surely do no harm, which seems not to have been a matter of course with those who heal by the knife and physic. It appears from the last Fargard that all or, at least, many diseases might be cured by spells and Barashnûm washing. It appears from Herodotus and Agathias that contagious diseases required the same treatment as uncleanness: the sick man was excluded from the community of the faithful, until cured and cleansed according to the rites.

"The unclean are confined in a particular place apart from all clean persons and objects. . . . All the unclean, all those struck with temporary death, the man who has touched dead matter, the woman in her menses, or just delivered of child, the leper, or the man who has made himself unclean for ever by carrying a corpse alone, stay there all the time of their uncleanness" (*op. cit.*, pp. xcii ff.).

The applicability of these passages is too obvious to call for comment.

We should have wished, had space permitted, to deal further with this question of authenticity by taking some of the individual rules and institutions and showing how they support Mosaic authenticity. The order, too, is another interesting subject on which Dr. Kent writes at random, and we should have liked to touch on the matter, but we can only find room to deal briefly with one or two aspects of the Hammurabi question. "The remarkable correspondence between many of these individual laws," writes Dr. Kent, "and those of Hammurabi, favors the conclusion that the principles underlying them, if not the detailed contents and form, were in part derived from the older code through the Canaanites" (p. 24). The "remarkable correspondence" has no existence in fact, and the "conclusion" rests on nothing more substantial than Dr. Kent's ignorance. No value can be attached to his allegations as to parallels, variations, etc. Thus he writes (p. 25):

Vol. LXV. No. 257. 9

"The penalty for stealing an ox in the Hebrew code is five oxen (Ex. xxii. 1), but in Hammurabi's code thirty, or if the owner was a poor man, ten-fold its value" (sect. 8). But he does not add—because he does not know—that manifold restitution for theft is to be found in archaic law all over the world (see Post Grundriss, vol. ii. pp. 430 ff.). Everywhere the reason is the same. Theft gives rise to the blood feud and this weakens and injures the community. So the lawgiver steps in with a heavy bribe to induce the aggrieved person to submit his case to the courts, instead of taking the remedy into his own hands: and the feeling of vengeance supplies the measure of the damages offered. In point of fact there is but one thing that is somewhat unusual about Hammurabi's rule—the high amount of damages payable: and in this respect Exodus conforms much more nearly to what is usual elsewhere. There is in truth nothing distinctive about the Hebrew rule.

We must limit ourselves to two more instances. The punishment for kidnapping (Ex. xxi. 16, and Hammurabi, sect. 14) is cited by Dr. Kent as an example of close agreement. But to this there are numerous parallels, including, e. g., the law of the Guatemalan natives. (See Post Grundriss, vol. ii. p. 355.) The reason is not far to seek. The offense itself naturally gives rise to the blood feud: but its nature is so injurious to the community that when the lawgiver steps in, he, while checking the feud, maintains and legalizes the death-penalty in order to protect society. Similar needs give rise to similar rules. Our other case is equally instructive. Exodus xxii. 4 (5) (which Dr. Kent misstates and therefore does not cite in this connection) is very similar to Hammurabi, sect. 57, but the following passage of an old Hindu law-book resembles *both* laws more closely than they resemble each other:—

"19. If damage is done by cattle, the responsibility falls on the owner. 20. But if [the cattle] were attended by a herdsman, [it

falls] on the latter. 21 [If the damage was done] in an unenclosed field near the road, [the responsibility falls] on the herdsman and on the owner of the field. 22 Five Māshas [are the fine to be paid] for [damage done by] a cow, 23. Six for a camel or a donkey, 24. Ten for a horse or a buffalo, 25. Two for each goat or sheep. 26. If all is destroyed, [the value of] the whole crop [must be paid and a fine in addition]." (Gautama xii. 19-25; cf., also, Manu viii. 239-241.)

The origin of such rules is easy to understand. The problem they solve must arise in every-day life wherever pastoral and agricultural occupations are pursued together, and the main outlines of the best solution are so obvious that they must have suggested themselves to able men in all countries. There is nothing distinctive about law of this kind. It is to be found in every community which includes both men who tend animals and men who till land.

And here we must take our leave of Dr. Kent and his disgraceful publication. We have sought to set forth his leading characteristics impartially, without exaggeration, but also without extenuation, for in a case like this the plainest language is also the best. The exposure of errors which are likely to mislead the public is, sometimes, a duty which must be resolutely undertaken.

ARTICLE VI.

ENGLISH DRAMATIC VERSE AFTER
SHAKESPEARE.BY PROFESSOR THEODORE W. HUNT, PH.D., LITT.D.,
PRINCETON, N. J.

THIS era includes the comprehensive period between Elizabeth and Victoria, an era of over three centuries, as contrasted with the half-century of the drama of the Golden Age, in which contrast is found a sufficiently striking difference between the dramatic character and product of the respective periods. There is a sense, indeed, in which English literature may be said to have had but one specifically dramatic age, all Post-Shakespearian dramatic product being properly classified as secondary. In this respect, English dramatic verse is strikingly distinct from English lyric as a steadily progressive literary evolution, and more in keeping with English epic, which reached as high a status in the poetry of Milton in the seventeenth century as it has done in any subsequent era.

Hence, it may, at the outset, be noticed that it is quite impossible to speak of the Historical Development of the Modern English Drama, as we speak of that of Modern English Prose or English Lyric, in the sense of discovering a progressive evolution of better and better product. If we call the Pre-Elizabethan Age preparative, as it was, and the Elizabethan, culminative, then, all that is Post-Elizabethan must be, at its best, but a little more than a reproduction, in varied and somewhat inferior form, of antecedent product. When it is said by Ward, "that all literary growths are continuous," it

would be sufficient to show in the case of the later English drama that it is not strictly a growth at all, but rather a literary history with its diversified features of progress and decline. It is this fact that Ward himself has in mind when he adds: "In literary, as in all other history, it is generally difficult to say where growth passes into decline, and where, in the midst of exuberant life, the first signs announce themselves of the beginning of the end." In other words, growth had ceased by "passing into decline," and it becomes the object of the student's researches to follow carefully the course of the decline and note any deviations from it to that which is better.

In any case, the first fact of interest as to the drama before us is, that it is a record of decline, however complex and concealed the causes of such a decline may be. These are found, in part, (a) in the uniform principle of literary reaction, (b) in the increasing emergence of non-dramatic conditions, and (c) in the necessary limitations of the human mind, making it incapable of the prolonged exercise of such a high order of literary genius, the literary history, in the main, following the course of the civic and social history of the nation. Be the causes what they may, what is called the Decadence of the Drama had definitely begun. The volume "From Shakespeare to Pope," by Gosse, is substantially applicable to dramatic poetry, as a specific form, well called "a mundane" order of poetry, seeking its sources in purely secular and temporal conditions. Saintsbury classifies the Plays of the century into four periods,—those of Marlowe, Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Massinger, respectively. The last of these is the era of decadence, becoming more and more decadent as the century closes. The Shakespearian Plays of the period are sufficient proof of such a

decadence, evincing its progress by an ever-increasing number of mere dramatic adventures and poetasters. What is known among the critics as the Artificial English Drama now prevailed, when the masters had disappeared, and the novices had assumed control.

THE EARLY STUART AND THE PURITAN PERIOD.

As we enter this era, including the reigns of James I. and Charles I., there is an explanation of decadence, as seen in the Loss of National Prestige. "Queen Elizabeth and the glories with which her name was identified seem all but forgotten." "Had England, at the time," writes Ward, "taken a resolute part in the great European struggle, the traditions of a great national epoch must have counted for much." "As it was," he adds, "the pacific policy of James, and the uncertainty in the councils of Charles, doomed England to virtual inaction in the midst of a tremendous European crisis, and the ancient glories rusted in the national consciousness." The stirring memories of Elizabethan days, of the Spanish Armada, and the triumphs of British arms were but dimly recalled by the Stuart kings. Hence the drama was out of sympathy with the current thought of the time, either at home or on the Continent. It was denationalized, isolated, and unsympathetic, localized in area, and positively restricted in the free expression of its national life. In the reign of James I., it is true, some of the old Elizabethan playwrights were still at work,—Beaumont, Fletcher, Jonson, Massinger, and Webster; as, in that of Charles I., there were Ford and Johnson, Massinger and Marlowe. The premonitions of decline, however, were at hand, hastened by the political disturbances of the time, and the approach of the Puritan non-dramatic era. Though some encouragement to the higher drama was given by James I., and though the tastes of

Charles I. and his queen were somewhat literary and in sympathy with true dramatic development, the environment was, in the main, unfriendly. The flagrant corruptions of the Court of James had left its baneful influence upon that of his successor; wider and wider distances were drawn between the classes and the masses. The best elements were in abeyance to the worst, until the English stage and drama were at length overwhelmed by the outbreak of the Revolution of 1640. Manifestly, the higher drama could not flourish under such conditions, despite the efforts of the last of the Elizabethans to sustain it. Even in comedy, the comedy of character gave way to the comedy of manners and intrigue and verbal artifice. Playwrights vied with each other in mere fertility of production and in the inverse ratio of its literary merit. Despite the efforts of Herbert and Chillingworth, Fuller, Taylor and Milton, the moral atmosphere of the time reached such a measure of defilement that it was impossible for a man of conscience "to draw his breath freely."

The culmination of this series of movements expressed itself in the Puritan Period of 1649-60, which, though brief, is crowded with critical events, historical and literary; stands midway between the monarchy of the early Stuarts and the anarchy of the later; contains within itself the extremes of evil and of good, and is, even yet, in all its bearings, something of a puzzle to literary and civic historians. Of dramatic history, it may be said that it had none. Seven years prior to its opening, in 1642, theaters were closed by due process of law, and not re-opened until the accession of Charles II., in 1660. It was, indeed, a penal offense even to be a spectator of plays. This is not the place in which to discuss the Puritan protest against the English drama, the most charitable conclusion being that, with pure motive and a

just occasion in the excesses of the time, some modification of their drastic method might have conduced to wholesome issues. What is known as the Anti-Theatrical literature of the time is of this violent and extreme character, culminating in Prynne's "*Histrio-Mastix*" (*The Players' Scourge*), in which he holds that all plays originate with the devil, and contribute directly to his dominance in the world. In an age when Taylor and Baxter and Bunyan were writing, it is not strange that, by way of reaction from the profligacy that had prevailed, these serious-minded Covenanters should have denounced all plays and players as of the devil, and in their zeal for Christian honor have exhibited an unchristian temper.

Nor is it any the less strange that, when the Puritans had had their day, and Charles II. returned from France with the latest schooling in Parisian ethics, all prior records should have been surpassed, and the English theater, now re-opened, should have become the synonym for mental imbecility and moral debauchery.

THE LATER STUART DRAMA—RESTORATION DRAMA.

This extends from the restoration of Charles II., in 1660, to the death of Dryden, in 1700, continuing its influence, more or less directly, into the reign of Queen Anne on to its close in 1714. As already suggested, in accounting for the special type of drama introduced at this time, scarcely any further cause need be assigned than that of Reaction. The Restoration itself was a reactionary movement in English politics and life, as contrasted with the immediately preceding Puritan Period. The restrictions of the Commonwealth could no longer be tolerated by a monarch and a court of the Restoration type, and this unbridled desire for fullest liberty naturally expressed itself in the re-opening of the theaters, in 1660. Just as the Puritans, at the opening of the inter-regnum, in

1649, represented a reactionary anti-dramatic movement against the antecedent dramatic order; so, in the later Stuart era, we note a reactionary dramatic movement against the antecedent anti-dramatic order, literary history here repeating itself, and in obedience to what we are wont to call an inevitable law of providence. Short as the era is, its position midway between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries of English history and literature gives it a character and influence altogether above its intrinsic merits, and makes it all the more essential that the interpretation of its place should be a just one.

Mr. Gosse, in describing the conditions of the English Drama after the Restoration, remarks, "that the drama took a place in English Literature during the last third of the seventeenth century relatively more prominent than it has ever taken since." "Certain sections of society," he adds, "were passionately addicted to theatrical amusements. Their appetite had been whetted by eighteen years of enforced privation." This imperious demand, of course, created a corresponding measure of supply. One of the chief reasons why dramatic literature now so prevailed was the specifically practical one of its immediate money returns. Scores of playwrights had been impatiently waiting for just such a demand for their theatrical product, and when the conservative policy of the Puritans gave way to the free indulgence of the Stuart Era these poverty-stricken authors emerged from their retreats with manuscripts in readiness, and the English market was fairly burdened with the weight of their dramatic wares. This is one reason, among others, why, on the one hand, so many authors of the day were playwrights, and, on the other, why so few of them attained to anything like literary eminence in dramatic verse.

If we inquire as to the characteristics of these Restoration

Plays, they may all be summarily expressed in the one word Servility,—mental, moral, literary, and official. The Restoration was that of Charles II. and his court, and monarchy itself was out-monarchied by the manner in which that which was written, in prose and verse, was written in abject deference to the Stuart will. It was the king and the courtiers and their immediate followers who suggested the themes and the general tenor of the tragedy and comedy; who smiled or frowned as the plays pleased or displeased them; on whom authors and actors were alike dependent for their daily living, in that they created by their influence the public demand for the stage. The drama was thus, out and out, servile: a drama of the court and the crown, and not of the great English commonalty; a drama of civil and religious partisanship, and not of unshackled opinion in church and state; mentally and morally inferior, because servile and incapable, thereby, of rising to anything like poetic primacy. It was, to this extent, wholly un-Elizabethan. It is in keeping with this view that Ward writes, "Had the Restoration drama been in true sympathy with the Elizabethans, it might have reached a commanding level of excellence," by which he means, had it been more catholic and independent, it would have been nobler and thoroughly in line with the best English traditions. "It is," he adds, "because it was untrue to these traditions that its history is that of a decay such as no brilliancy can conceal."

More specifically, he gives us a satisfactory triple explanation of this decline, when he states, that this later drama was "untrue to the higher purpose of the dramatic art, to the nobler tendencies of the national life, and to the eternal demands of the moral law." Each of these instances of unfaithfulness, it may be said, was but the result or evidence of that base servility that stifled all genius and patriotism and

art. When Collier issued, in 1698, his "Short View of the Profaneness and Immorality of the English Stage," it was not altogether against specific moral abuses that he was contending, but against the entire spirit and motive of the drama of his day as unworthy of the antecedent history of England, as un-English as it was un-Elizabethan. High dramatic art gave way to the lowest forms of Sentimental Comedy; and the direful teachings of Hobbes, that conscience is a myth, and right and wrong unfounded antitheses, became the current doctrine of the hour. It was the High Noon of imbecility and immorality, when the English stage, according to Henry Irving, was "a mere appendage of court life, a mirror of patrician vice hanging at the girdle of fashionable profligacy."

Of dramatists busily at work, in this intervening era, there is no lack, as almost every writer of any literary talent made the attempt, at least, to meet the increasing dramatic demand. Hence the names of Etherege, Aphra Behn, Davenant, Wycherley, Farquhar, Vanbrugh, Otway, Lee, Southerne and Congreve. High over all, in general and special gifts, the name of John Dryden stands, the semi-dramatic work of Milton; giving him, also, an historic place among the Restoration dramatists. Of these several authors it is not within our present purpose to speak. Suffice it to say, that they reveal, in part, the fact that dramatic literature was a representative poetic type of the time; that the great majority of these playwrights serve but to show what imposing proportions poetic mediocrity can assume, and to prove the truth of Ward's statement "that of all forms of literary art the drama can least reckon without its responsibilities." Here and there, in this vast volume of dramatic product, an author or a Play of distinctive merit appears, the nearest approximation to the excellence of Dryden appearing in the work of Congreve,

author of "The Mourning Bride," "The Double Dealer," "Love for Love," whom Dryden praises in unstinted terms, to whom Pope dedicates his *Iliad*, and of whom Voltaire says, "that he raised the glory of comedy to a greater height than any English writer before or since."

It was Dryden, however, who was the "hero of the age and the stage," as central in later Stuart literary history as Shakespeare was in the earlier, and Sheridan in the following era; a dramatic critic as well as composer; a writer of tragedies, comedies, prologues and epilogues; the accepted censor of his age; and, despite the ridicule of Buckingham in his "Rehearsal," possessed of undoubted literary genius, though often prostituted to the basest ends. It was reserved for Dryden to illustrate, at once, the servility and scurrility of the Stuart drama, and, also, to redeem its name from the charge of mental mediocrity. The attempt of Milton in his "Samson Agonistes" to take a part in this drama is as interesting as it is anomalous, as if, in the character of the last of the Elizabethans, he would recall his contemporaries to the forgotten traditions of their fathers; protest, in the name of truth and virtue, against the riotous rule of the Philistines in literature, and ominously point out to Charles II. the certain fate of those who set at naught the laws of God and man. In the same volume with "Paradise Regained," and issued in 1671, but a few years after the publication, in 1667, of "Paradise Lost," this great English champion of purity and truth persisted in uttering his message in the ears of a king and court utterly indifferent thereto, absorbed as they were in the dissolute dramas of Aphra Behn and Nathaniel Lee.

It is not strange that this order of things required nothing less than the Great Rebellion of 1688, to nullify, in part at least, its baneful influence and institute a new and better

order. The substitution of the House of Orange for the Stuart dynasty was not only the substitution of limited monarchy for absolutism, of Protestantism for Romanism, and of mental freedom for mental bondage, but it was the introduction of an entirely new spirit in literature, and, thus, of a distinctively preparative literary movement, as the later century approached. Even the Orange dramatists felt its influence, while the protestations of Collier became, at length, so effective that authors and actors alike were placed under bonds to keep within the limits of moral propriety. Dryden himself acknowledged the substantial truth of the charges against him, and, in the two years of his life yet remaining, did what he could to redeem his record and that of the age which he represented. In the closing year of the century, 1700, Dryden died, and the Restoration Drama passed into history. The way was now fully opened for the Augustan Era and the English Drama of the Eighteenth Century.

THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY DRAMA.

In so far as time is concerned, this period extends from the opening of Queen Anne's reign, in 1702, well on toward the close of the reign of George III., its actual ending in 1820 taking us well into the first quarter of the century following. Hence, we notice, at the outset, that, in so far as the drama is concerned, much of the activity of the Stuart Era proper passed over into the eighteenth century, such dramatists as Wycherley, and Cibber, and Vanbrugh, and Farquhar, and Rowe producing plays within each era, thus serving to connect the drama of the two centuries. This is especially true as to English Comedy. As Ward states it, "Both what was weakest and what was brightest in the English Comedy of the Eighteenth Century already existed in the Seventeenth." Hence, it is urged, "that Goldsmith has a predecessor in

Farquhar, and that Sheridan is but the legitimate successor of Congreve and the adopter of Vanbrugh," the rise of Sentimental Comedy, as fairly attributed both to Steele and Cibber, finding thus its rightful place in the period preceding.

No student of this era can fail to note the dramatic influence of Dryden, in the sphere of comedy, the acknowledged leader of the Stuart Era. In so far as tragedy is concerned, these conclusions must be modified, the tragic excellence of the Age of Dryden finding no worthy successor nor parallel in the later age. "The tragedy of the Eighteenth Century," writes Saintsbury, "is almost beneath contempt, being, for the most part, a faint French echo or else transpontine melodrama, with a few plaster-cast attempts to reproduce an entirely misunderstood Shakespeare." Indeed, it may be said, that, although the revival of interest in the Shakespearian Drama, in the seventeenth century, was mainly due to the agency of Dryden, and, though actors such as Garrick and authors such as Rowe and Addison did what they could to reinstate the influence of this "great national genius," still, the drama of this century, especially in tragedy, cannot be said even to remind us of Shakespeare, either in content or spirit. The century is, in no sense, dramatic, as was the Elizabethan or even the Stuart Era. From the very opening of the century, literary interests assumed other and more absorbing types, partly due to changes in political sentiment and social life, and partly to a decided decadence of dramatic genius itself. If we seek for the causes of such a decadence, we note that the century opened as a distinctive Prose era, on the periodical side, as expressed in the *Spectator* and the *Tatler* and similar collections, while, within the province of poetry itself, the formal school of Pope was engaging the chief attention of the critics, and impressing itself upon the literature of the nation at large.

Thus, if we call for a list of our eighteenth-century dramatists, we shall be surprised to find that the number of names, all told, is a limited one, while that of the masters in the art may be reduced to here and there a name. According to Schlegel, a genius of the first rank in tragedy did not appear in the century. "Why has this revival of the admiration of Shakespeare," asks Schlegel, "remained unproductive for dramatic poetry," his suggestive answer being "that he has been too much the subject of astonishment, as an unapproachable genius who owed everything to nature and nothing to art." "Had he been considered," he adds, "more from an artistic point of view, it would have led to an endeavor to understand the principles which he followed in his practice and to an attempt to master them." The causes of the absence of Shakespearian genius in the eighteenth century lie deeper down, we submit, and farther back than this language of Schlegel's would argue. The fact of its absence is, however, a potent one. Here and there are visible traces of dramatic power, sufficient to awaken the interest of the inquiring student and make it possible for him to prophesy the near appearance of a better day. Not to mention the names of those already cited as properly belonging to both centuries, such as Congreve and Cibber, we note the names of Addison and Steele, and, especially, of Goldsmith and Sheridan, who may be said to be the two specially dramatic authors of the century proper, the dramatic translations of Goethe and Schiller by Scott and Coleridge, respectively, and the dramatic verse of Byron properly belonging to the succeeding age.

Of the dramatic genius of Addison, as seen in his "Cato," it may be said, that, despite the favor with which the tragedy was received by the Augustan public, it cannot justly be regarded as reaching anything more than average merit. Pre-

pared with a view to reinstate classical ideals in English Verse and, yet, prepared amid the political agitations of the time, it cannot be said to have been either a literary or a political success, its contemporary repute being strangely due to the fact that each of the warring factions of the day, the Whig and the Tory, insisted in claiming it as an exponent of its party principles, a tragedy full, as Ward expresses it, of "effective commonplaces" and so exalting French and classical models in dramatic composition as to throw discredit on the old Elizabethan models and thereby serve to check that Shakespearian movement in whose advance alone the future excellence of the English drama was to lie. With Addison, tragic composition was a left-handed and an unnatural exercise, his gifts and mission lying in quite other literary spheres.

Of Steele, author of "The Conscious Lovers," "the first English comedy," according to Schlegel, "that can be called moral," suffice it to say, that he shares, with Cibber, the honor of having introduced *Sentimental Comedy*, and, with Addison, the honor of having effectively rebuked the literary immorality of the age.

Goldsmith's dramatic work was not the ablest part of his product as a writer. Author of "The Good-natured Man," of which he himself was a signal example, and of the still abler composition "She Stoops to Conquer," it is just to say that each of them is a worthy expression of English Comedy, and holds its place even yet in general literary esteem. The first of them, according to Johnson, was "the best comedy seen on the English stage for forty years" (1728-68), while the second, according to Gosse, is "one of the great comedies of the world." What Goldsmith did, he did with high motive and on sound literary principles. All defects

conceded, his dramatic work is far above the average of his time, and may justly be cited in connection with that of Sheridan, the leading dramatic exponent of the time; author of "The Rivals," written at twenty-two, and of "The School for Scandal," written at twenty-four; known among critics "as the best existing English comedy of intrigue," each of them being still in favor on the boards of the English and the American theater. Based on the best examples of Restoration Comedy, and on such a model as Molière, they justly remind us of Elizabethan traditions, and justify a hopeful outlook into the following century.

THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY DRAMA.

This is a period so recent that but little need be said as to its type and merits. This much, however, may safely be ventured, that it cannot be called a high order of drama, despite the fact that a goodly number of workers have been busy throughout the century, so that the dramatic product is by no means limited. As Saintsbury states it, "There has always been something out of joint with English nineteenth-century tragedy." The same might be said of comedy. The drama is academic and artificial, rather than popular and natural, and the spontaneous expression of native genius, the "mere by-work" of most of the poets, and not their legitimate literary calling. From the fact of the high esteem in which such a secondary dramatist as Knowles was held, it may be argued that the critical standard was lamentably low, that tragedies and comedies devoid of dramatic impulse and vigor were classified as representative. This inferiority is somewhat remarkable when we recall, as has been suggested, the large number of English poets of the last century who were dramatic authors,—Byron, author of *Cain*; Shelley, in his "*Prometheus Unbound*"; Coleridge, in his "*Fall of Robespierre*"; Southey,

in "Sappho"; Bulwer, in "Richelieu"; Landor, in "Roderic"; Matthew Arnold, in "Empedocles on Etna"; Browning, in his Monologues; Mrs. Browning, in her renderings of "Euripides" and "Prometheus"; Scott, in his translation of Goethe; and Tennyson, in his several dramatic productions; while to these may be added the names of authors now working among us. Here is a wide variety and volume of effort, suggesting a favorable comparison with the days of Elizabeth, and yet a living critic, with this product before him, affirms of Browning's "Blot in the 'Scutcheon," that it is the one play of the century which shows any tragic vigor in its central part. Of these poets it may be said, without any exception, that they were dramatic writers without being dramatists; that their Plays were delineative, and not essentially dramatic; that some of them, as Browning, wrote Monologues or Monodramas only; that others, such as Scott, translated dramas, and that others still, as Landor and Shelley, failed to apprehend aright the structural side of this order of verse. It is thus that we read "that Byron's tragedies are not the worst part of his work"; that "Scott had no dramatic faculty"; that "Shelley's 'Cenci' is notactable"; and that the drama of the century as a whole lacks the quality of greatness. These are just conclusions when the reader sits down to find in this product a half-dozen specimens that may faintly remind him of Marlowe and Johnson.

The comparative failure of Tennyson in this field is sufficient evidence that dramatic genius was not one of the gifts of the gods to the England of his day.

CONTEMPORARY BRITISH DRAMA.

Of the Contemporary British Drama, represented, especially, in Swinburne, Austin, Jones, and Phillips, suffice it to say, that it has merit, though not masterly merit; that, while indi-

cating an advance upon the later Victorian Era, it is not Elizabethan. The strength of the opening century lies elsewhere,—in lyric verse as of old, and, especially, in historical, critical, and philosophic prose. Possibly, under conditions as yet non-existent, English verse may assume epic and dramatic eminence, and remind us, once again, of Milton and Shakespeare.

ARTICLE VII.

THE ETHICAL FACTOR IN POLITICS.

BY THE REVEREND FRANCIS LITTLE HAYES, D.D.,
TOPEKA, KANSAS.

THERE is an intimate relationship between politics and commerce. So much political activity has its motive in business considerations that the financial factor seems, on the surface, to be the dominant factor in politics. So obtrusive has been this factor in our own national history that a brilliant United States Senator dared a few years ago to say that the Golden Rule and the Ten Commandments had no place in American politics. He was speaking not of theories but of actual conditions as he interpreted them.

Nevertheless a look beneath the surface both of history and of present conditions finds strong ground for the conviction expressed in the following proposition: The ethical factor has been and is now increasingly the most potent one in politics.

It was comparatively early in the history of modern civilization that the tyranny of kings found its only effective buttress in the claim to a "divine right." The inspiration moving the barons to make the stand at Runnymede that wrested from King John the Great Charter of English liberties sprang less from the consciousness of their might than from the impelling sense that right was on their side. It was John Wycliffe's proclamation through a translated Bible and an army of Lollards of the doctrine of a common fatherhood and an all-inclusive brotherhood that started the political earthquake

causing British absolutism first to tremble on its throne and later to totter to its fall in the days of Cromwell and Charles the First.

The whole modern ferment making for civil liberty and now beginning to convulse the Eastern nations, as in former generations it has revolutionized the Western, is everywhere traceable to the ethical yeast. It is this ethical yeast, as Benjamin Kidd has shown in his "Social Evolution" and in his later work entitled "Western Civilization," that has been the chief evolutionary principle in political progress.

It is not infrequently said that the "Compact" drawn up by the Pilgrims in the cabin of the Mayflower has had more far-reaching political effects than any other document penned in modern times. Whether that be an extravagant assertion or not it is plainly demonstrable that "the tap-root of all that is wholesome and permanent in modern democracy" is sunk in the very soil out of which that compact grew. An element of the same spirit that impelled the Pilgrims and the Puritans to break away from the English shores prompted their descendants in "seventy-six" to break away from the British government. It was not so much because taxation without representation was expensive as because it was unjust that they waged a war so costly in money and in blood.

Later another war was waged on American soil. When the first gun was fired at Fort Sumter it was popularly supposed that Cotton was king. When, four years later, the dove of peace finally alighted at Appomattox, it had been demonstrated that the ethical principle of human freedom sat on a loftier throne.

The modern sociologist, studying history and society in his scientific laboratory, is now announcing that "the ruling class ordering the world to their own ends are everywhere en-

countering a process that is gradually subordinating their selfish ends to something higher." In this encounter absolute monarchy has gone down in the West and is trembling in the East, slavery is making its last stand in the Congo wilds and commercialism is now brought to bay on the great industrial battle-field. All the political developments of the past are but consecutive pages in the text-book from which the world is slowly learning the great lesson of history that "selfishness is disintegrating and dangerous—that selfishness and any system inspired by selfishness ultimately falls of its own weight." The time has past in Anglo-Saxon history when the great political problems centered around royal selfishness. To-day our greatest political problems center about social and commercial selfishness.

Our race problems are at bottom moral problems, and will never reach a solution till they are settled in conformity with the fundamental principles of ethics. Our labor problem, complicated as it appears, is simply a question of fair dealing between man and man. The problem of trusts has its economic as well as its ethical features, but there is no momentum in the material considerations involved powerful enough to unseat tyrannous capitalism. From one side of the trough goes up the shriek, "I want my share!" From the other side shrills the answer, "You are getting more than your share!" They are two squeals, but they come from the same breed of hogs. This situation is enough to insure a fight, but it insures no victory for either side. Here was the fatal inadequacy of the French Revolution. The dominating ethical element essential to real progress and to final solutions was lacking in the body politic. But when up from the multitude there rumbles the cry concerning any controlling influence, "It is unjust! It is wrong!" then at last you have a movement that is ominous;

for if it gathers weight and speaks with the tone of moral conviction it means doom to the power at which it is aimed, however armed and intrenched that power may be.

When the cry of "discrimination" is raised between shippers and railroads, if it only means, "Give me my turn at the trough," the great voting public will not give attention long enough to accomplish lasting results; but if a clamorous cry goes up, "This is tyrannous—it is not a square deal for all," and the resulting inquiry demonstrates that there is truth in the charge, then an irresistible political movement has begun.

Let it be known that the political grafter, the insurance magnate, the waterer of stocks, has been running amuck among the Ten Commandments, call his offense by the plain name of stealing, and the Folk or the Hughes who does it passes into office at the next election on the indignant votes of his fellow-citizens. The railroads will no longer kill fifteen thousand people a year when the great common people, whom you cannot fool all the time, attaches the ethical name of "murder" to the willful neglect of roadbeds and of safety appliances, and to the requiring of trainmen to work continuously seven days in the week and sometimes seventeen hours in the day.

Theories offered in explanation of the present financial flurry are legion. There is significance because more than a little truth in the answer of a famous correspondent of the *Philadelphia Press* to the question "What hit Wall Street?" when he asserts that it was the faith of the common people in honesty and justice coming, through the avenue of politics, up against the leagued gamblers intrenched in their towering castles of speculation.

Organized greed, which has long waged victorious political

warfare by simply blowing the trumpet of the particular political party seeming to be most powerful or most amenable to its "special interest," is nearly panic-stricken by the discovery that the snap of the party whip is fast losing its old-time terror, and a political factor of comparatively recent origin, known as "the independent voter," is to hold the balance of power in the immediate future.

The recent November elections afford startling intimation that he may already be succeeding both Democrat and Republican as the dominant agency in American politics. Independent voting resulted in Massachusetts in such a defection from the Democratic party as to threaten its official standing; in New York City in the repudiation of the fusion between the Republican party and the Independence League; in Louisville in the overthrow of what would normally be a Democratic city government; in Salt Lake City in the election of the American instead of the hitherto successful Mormon Republican candidate; in San Francisco in the election of Dr. Taylor as mayor over a combination of the reigning Republican machine and many labor unionists.

And who is the independent voter? In general he is the man who votes for the principle that he believes is right and for the candidate that he believes is honest. It is true that his ranks are often swelled by those taking the side that they think will best serve their selfish interest; but he is the hope of the future because by a large majority he is the man who is more influenced by ethical considerations than by party name.

This surmounting of the moral element over the partisan element in politics is the outgrowth of a mighty principle that, in the evolution of society, is fast emerging into clear view. It is already discernible to the forthlooking vision, whether

it be contemplating national or international relations, that the rivalry of the future is to be between great opposing systems of social order, the determining factor of success being the degree to which the highest ethical principles have been adopted.

This line of cleavage has one of its many illustrations in the gigantic strides now making in the prohibition of promiscuous liquor-selling until half the territory of the United States is under prohibitory law, with prospect of sweeping and resistless progress in the near future. Nobody can sanely doubt that this already stupendous political edifice, so rapidly adding story to story, rests upon the bedrock of a great moral conviction. The organized traffic is finally recognizing that its gigantic corruption fund is powerless to arrest the movement, and that—because, even in the political arena, money, though it be martialled in endless battalions, cannot stand against an aroused moral sentiment.

It constitutes one of the distinct signs of the times when a popular United States senator tours the country delivering to applauding audiences numbering thousands a lecture with the title "The Public Virtue a Question of Politics," and asserting from the standpoint of the statesman-politician that "the most serious perils besetting our institutions are moral perils," and that "democracy requires for its life fidelity to right living."

If the pulpit of the present day is losing its relative pre-eminence in moral leadership it is because the political paper and the political stump are stealing its thunder. Among the two most effective preachers of righteousness at the present time—certainly the most widely heard—are the president of the United States and the opposing party's most popular candidate for president. I have seen the report of a gentleman

who heard Governor Hughes's most recent political address. He affirms that the parts of the speech which were most applauded were the parts which were most like preaching; that his appeal was distinctly moral and his affirmations emphatically ethical in substance. Can there be any intelligent dissent from the judgment which this "onlooker" expresses when he avers that no man can get the grip on the public which President Roosevelt has, which Mr. Bryan manages to hold, and to which Mr. Hughes has come so quietly and so quickly, unless there is in him something of moral leadership?

All this signifies that there is an undercurrent of assent in the popular mind to Senator Dolliver's proposition that the public virtue is a question of politics. While the American people do not, and never will, believe that it is any part of civil government to save men's souls, or that intrinsic moral character can, in the nature of things, be produced by legislative enactment, they have, nevertheless, detected the fallacy that lurks in the oft-quoted aphorism "You cannot make men moral by act of parliament." They are rapidly learning by actual experience that law enactment and law enforcement working harmoniously do in actuality promote public morals, and check, and even in good measure repress, certain obtrusive forms of immorality.

It is a long-accepted and fundamental principle of law that the safety of the public morals is a primary concern of government. The officials and courts of various states have alleged this as the ground of their decision against lotteries and prize-fights. The Kansas Supreme Court in the case of *Kansas vs. Ziebold and Habelin*, 123 U. S. Rep. 623-662, alleged, as one of the grounds of its decision, that "*public morals . . . may be endangered by the general use of intoxicating drinks.*"

The United States Supreme Court has repeatedly averred that "no legislature can bargain away the public morals," adding, in the case of *Stone vs. Miss.* that "the people themselves cannot do it, much less their servants." Following the same principle, familiar to jurisprudence since the days of the Justinian Code and similarly expressed by many of our highest tribunals, the highest court of the State of New York, the Court of Appeals, has said: "Sound morality is the corner-stone of the social edifice. Whatever disturbs that is condemned under the fundamental rule."

In a country with such a spirit as we have been tracing supreme among the people, and with such a principle as that outlined above regnant in its fundamental law, what is to be the future political attitude toward unnecessary Sunday labor and toward professional pleasure-venders holding public spectacles for pay on the Sabbath-day? The history of civilization has demonstrated that the decalogue lies at the foundation of the social structure, and that the law of a weekly day for physical rest and moral and spiritual refreshment is as inherent in the very constitution of human nature as either of the other nine. "Since," as Froude expresses it, "our human laws are but copies more or less imperfect of the eternal laws as far as we can read them," enactments for the preservation of the Sabbath have gone upon civil statute-books and been repeatedly confirmed by civil courts; and since the trend of civil government is steadily toward increasing accord with the ethical standards of immutable law, we may be confident that the future will see both the enactment and the enforcement of such laws not diminished but augmented.

The state need not be violently agitated when a group of boys play a Sunday game in a secluded lot, or a family party indulge in festivities out of harmony with Sabbath sanctities

in a private house, but when great throngs gather in public places to support a continuous institution the motive for whose maintenance on the part of professional players and actors and their financial backers is purely a business motive residing in gate receipts and ticket money, then the safety of the day involving the public welfare is at stake.

There is in some quarters the need of a reminder that, while under our form of government the state has no alliance with churches as ecclesiastical organizations, it cannot afford not to welcome, and in decisions of its highest legal tribunals it has welcomed, the aid of religion in its function of fostering public safety through maintaining and promoting public morality. The state is not allied to the church; but it is the privilege and duty of the state to see to it that the church shall have a fair chance in ministering to the moral education of the people, which, especially in a democracy, is so essential to the perpetuity of the state itself. Indeed, it is now widely and gravely questioned whether the state should be expected to furnish the moral education adequate for citizenship, and whether it should not assume, if not invite, the coöperation of the institutions of religion in that department of public education. It might, therefore, even be claimed that the state is serving directly her own interest if on one day in the week she preserves for the church the right of way to the attention of the people.

This digression led us away from a reference to Sunday theaters. If, now, it be a principle of civil law that the state "cannot bargain away the public morals," then, even on those days when the theater is licensed to run, the state has a right and a duty to interfere with the presentations of the stage that afford a morbid stimulus to crime or distinctly and flagrantly promote immorality by inflaming lustful appetite.

The foregoing may serve as specimens of the truth that there is yet unworked ore in that vein of civil prerogative which Blackstone touches in his definition of municipal law, as "a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power in a state commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong."

Politics has been inaptly called a game. It may be more exactly characterized as a warfare, in which there are the two forever contending forces—right and wrong. The battle-front fluctuates, now yielding, now advancing, but in the progress of our Anglo-Saxon civilization the changing location of the firing-line has moved steadily onward from one abandoned outpost to another before the superior might of right. Greed, graft, mere financial self-interest win skirmishes and temporary advantages. Moral principle wins all the decisive battles, which mark the permanent stages of political progress.

As it is the victorious general who is remembered, so the politicians who occupy a high niche in history's wall are the leaders who were on the right side of great moral issues. There are still corrupt men in politics, but it is reassuring to consider what ethical standards of character are generally recognized as essential to fitness for high public office.

This article began with Senator Ingalls's cynical reference to the decalogue and the Golden Rule. It shall end with a more recent mention of them by another political leader, whose remarkable influence in this nation is preëminently a moral influence. Says President Roosevelt, "Our whole movement is simply and solely to make the decalogue and the Golden Rule of some practical moment in the business life of the community."

ARTICLE VIII.

CRITICAL NOTES.

ROMANTIC PSYCHOLOGIZING.¹

The literature of the psychological analysis of religion continues to grow, though it cannot be said that the additions are making any notable contributions to the subject. Professor James's "Varieties of Religious Experience" covered the subject so thoroughly, and gave such a mass of material, that it is likely that the new books for some time to come will do little else than thresh over the materials which are found in that marvelous book. Professor Pratt frankly acknowledges his indebtedness to Professor James; and, even if he had not, his book shows everywhere the influence of the Cambridge professor.

The present volume is suggestive on many accounts. For one thing it has a frank and straightforward tone, which is not dropped when he approaches the practical aspects of his views. Most of the psychologists either have not endeavored to define the practical outcome of their views, or, when they have approached a point where the practical application seemed to be the next thing, have avoided it. But Professor Pratt knows where he is going, and does not hesitate to tell you about it; and for this reason his book, which is intended for untechnical as well as technical readers, will appeal to people who have little knowledge of psychological science as such. Moreover, he writes a chapter on conclusions which is but a practical application and illustration of the results of his point of view, and this too is exceptional.

It has always seemed to the present writer that Coe and Star-

¹ The Psychology of Religious Belief. By James B. Pratt, Ph.D., Assistant Professor in Williams College. 12mo. Pp. 327. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.50.

buck, and others like them, seemed afraid to face the practical results that were to be expected from their views. Doubtless this is not the case, but so it has seemed; and, for that reason, Professor Pratt's book is likely to be more effective in clearing up minds that are beclouded on this matter, than were the volumes of the two authors just named.

But the clarification likely to result is not likely, in the minds of many, to be in the acceptance of Professor Pratt's views, as will be shown presently. It is more likely to result in the defining of views, and the recognition of the fact that the one thing most needed now in the philosophical world is a new statement and announcement of a-priorism, and some fresh utterance upon the original powers of the human intellect. Physiological psychology and its various adjuncts have had their innings, and it is time we heard a little more of the other side, though the other side is not wanting exactly. The abandonment of the intellect and the intellectual judgments, the general discrediting of all forms of intellectual authority in religion, was to be expected with the general onslaught on creeds, and the general refusal to accept finalities from councils, synods, and bishops. Indeed, as far back as the publication of Kidd's "Social Evolution," it was seen that the battle was on between a form of religious approach which was based on the intellect and that which bases itself on the emotions.

It will be well, in reviewing Professor Pratt's book, to take his chapter on conclusions first, as showing certain things which lie on the very surface of this inquiry. He says that "there is a general reaction against uncritical acceptance of the authority of tradition in all fields of thought," and cites the changed political views and conceptions, in which the great state papers of American history are held as evidence of this fact, in politics as well as religion, philosophy, and science. And all these things he thinks are due to "psychological atmosphere of the times." He thinks that any disposition to hold to the former views of these documents is a symptom of the attitude of mind, which in religion may be

designated "the religion of primitive credulity." This is the main illustration in the closing chapter, as indicative of the changed attitude of mind in public matters.

Now it so happens that just here we have the best possible opportunity of judging Professor Pratt's accuracy in judging what the current psychological forces are, and what they are producing, and it is hardly too much to say that he could not possibly have been more unfortunate in his choice and analysis than he is in this one. Whom would Professor Pratt choose in this land to-day as the clearest expositors of the sound political theory of democracy? Would he or not take men like the late Carl Schurz, like Moorfield Storey, like Professor Sumner, like Professor Laughlin, and others of this type? And yet these and a great many more like them, comprising for the most part the soundest and most thorough-going students of political theory, are almost to a man agreed that the popular departure from the ideas of the Declaration of Independence, which Dr. Pratt styles of the nature of the "religion of primitive credulity," is one of the most deplorable evidences, not of advancing thought, but lack of thought and power of discernment, which this country has ever seen. So far from abandoning the Declaration of Independence because it is no longer in accord with their political thought, it is rather because of their lack of thought that the masses have acted concerning these ideas as they have. The proof for this conclusion is also at hand. If the reaction from the doctrines of that great document were due to advanced thought, we should expect greater evidence of political independence and judgment. The critical attitude is universally accompanied by the extremes of individualism. But, as a matter of fact, side by side with the imperialism which has embarked on a colonial policy, now seen to be ruinous and utterly foolish, is the increased concentration of power in a single individual to the almost utter abandonment of some of the elementary ideas of democracy. There has been no time in the life of the present writer when political independence was less in vogue than now! No time when the president of the

United States could have or would have dreamed of having so much power concentrated in him as is the case at the present moment! To hold that this results from the critical attitude of the newly awakened political intellect of the land is something little short of ludicrous. In fact, the very illustration which Dr. Pratt has chosen is the one which his opponents would most naturally have chosen with which to confute him. Party government, party subservience even by men who know better, never did their deadly work more effectively than now. Nor are the literati exempt in this very matter. A college professor not far from the beautiful spot where Professor Pratt himself has his locus wrote not so very long ago in a private letter, when a block of United States Steel was given to the College, that he deplored it, since it made the dealing with certain forms of the tariff more difficult and delicate, if it did not interdict them entirely. Even the literati are fearful of being individual and determinate as regards the present political conditions. If Professor Pratt can find no better practical illustration of awakened critical powers, he is sorely pressed indeed.

But before we leave this part of the discussion, it might as well be said now, as at any time, that this field, one of the best for the study of the prevailing opinions and psychological conditions in the land, is almost entirely neglected by Professor Pratt. In Part II. of his book, where this subject might have been profitably considered, he ventures into a field for which he obviously lacks full equipment. In the matter of religious belief as it existed and exists among primitive peoples, as well as the religions of India and Israel, he has obviously accepted second-hand views, and has not allowed for great varieties of interpretation, which are not only equal in value but equally suggestive, whether soundly grounded or not. There is no department where greater uncertainty prevails at this moment than in the fundamental conceptions involved in the history of religions. There is in this part altogether a lack of all-round knowledge. Nobody who knows the *Ausgangspunkt* of modern literary criticism of the Bible, Vol. LXV. No. 257. 11

but knows also, that it is filled with stupidities and pedantries which are insufferable in anybody but higher critics, a fact which the critics themselves recognize. With the advanced critical views for the most part, the present writer has absolute sympathy. He believes in general in the work of the critics, and has absolutely nothing to fear from them or their work. But the naïve assumptions of this portion of Professor Pratt's book and his ready acceptance of the dicta of just one form of higher criticism are almost as good a proof of the attitude involved in the religion of primitive credulity as is his examination of the present status of the Declaration of Independence. It would not be absolutely fair to say that Part II. of this book is valueless; but it is fair to say that others have stated these views very much better than Professor Pratt has, and that students of the history of religion cannot help feeling that here the author merely recites the views of others which he has but partially assimilated. The views themselves are open to great criticism in many aspects.

The technical part of the book is the best, though this also has a certain indefinable fragmentary character, which makes it unsatisfactory in a way which is hard to define. Where the chapter becomes vital and deals with fundamental matters, we are met with a quotation from Professor James, or the thing emerges without having brought us anywhere. Professor Pratt is a believer in the religion of feeling; and, reduced to lowest terms, his position is about as follows: All intellectual processes are necessarily more or less faulty, and, since none of them can be infallible, no enduring religion can be based upon them. That is to say, a religion which is primarily intellectual must be a religion of authority, and a religion of authority is substantially impossible. The "religion of thought" can never have the attribute of finality, which is essential to religion. Belief as such is not a matter of evidence, but of a psychological process, of which it may be affirmed in general that the subject will believe as much as he can. What he believes and why he believes are accidents rather than results of choice. Hence the "religion of

thought" is untenable. The stages preceding the "religion of thought" are grouped under the title "religion of primitive credulity," already alluded to above. It is merely the child-like and uncritical acceptance of what one is told, and does not involve scrutiny nor the critical faculties. The abiding form of religion is "the religion of feeling," which is, in effect, some personal experience, in which the only evidence is personal experience and which cannot be subjected to review or criticism. What form it takes depends upon circumstances; but, being inward and personal, "it is not subject to the law of the mind, neither indeed can it be," to paraphrase a well-known passage from St. Paul. Under this view the Bible will still be interesting, but not authoritative; and, in general, religion will be simply the personal expression of some form of devotion. His position is admirably summed up in the statement in the conclusion: "In abandoning reason as the sufficient basis for religion, we are forced back on the region of feeling and of instinctive and unreasoned demands and intuitions. Here must Religion take up her stand and make her fight. From this quarter she must draw her chief supplies or be starved into surrender."

The most striking fact about this general position is that it leaves so many loopholes that one can scarcely know where to begin. Take, for example, the historical facts of Christianity, whatever one holds them to be. The history of the literary documents is surely a matter of evidence, is it not? And after the documents have been subjected to the test by which evidence is judged, there remains again the evidence of the validity of the material of the documents themselves. What becomes of a religion of feeling merely, when we are dealing with matters of evidence? Now, to be sure, absolute certainty, like the certainty which can be obtained in a problem in geometry, is not to be obtained in anything but the pure sciences; but surely the facts of religion, especially of a religion like Christianity, must involve certain intellectual conceptions of religion *per se* by which we go about discussing the evidence for or against a religion. And if any intellectual

basis of religion is to be found whatever, it must be a basis which is grounded in the use of the reason. Doubtless there is an ultra-rational element that enters into the personal acceptance of any faith, and which arises probably in what we call the religious feeling. But to assume, from this fact, that there can be no sufficient basis in reason for religion, is simply to turn the religious life into bedlam. And bedlam it is, where the rational limitations which are everywhere discernible in the New Testament are discarded. And to the modern bedlam nothing has contributed more than the prattle about the psychological basis of religion. There is probably no sect that could subscribe more readily to Professor Pratt's doctrine than the Christian Scientists,—one more of the curious phenomena of an age "whose critical faculties are alert," and whose "skeptical instincts" are rejecting everything right and left which savors of authority! As a matter of fact, here again, Professor Pratt has not read the signs of the times aright. Credulity flourishes in this very age as it probably never has; and, oddly enough, it was Professor James who appeared before a committee of the Massachusetts Legislature in opposition to a law which forbade the practice of the healing art by Christian Scientist practitioners, without previous examination by the State Board of Health. The same thing is true when one examines the enormous output of "fake" medicines, the wholesale quackery on every side. These people, according to the "psychological atmosphere of the times" as described by Professor Pratt, have thrown "authority" overboard. Indeed they have, rational authority. But they are one seven times more subjects of superstition, and have abandoned reason in religion and medicine and almost everything else, quite to the fulfillment of Professor Pratt's theory. Thus in medical practice, as in political practice, we have exactly similar phenomena,—the abandonment of rational standards of reason as the basis of religion, accompanied by the most grotesque and absurd forms of superstition! Dean Briggs thinks the same phenomena can be seen in the theories of education; and thus these three fields—education, medicine,

and religion—afford at the present time a very fair illustration of the way “feeling” works as a practical standard. Not that religious feeling is not a real thing, and capable of analysis, and that it has not a form of authority, which is as true and vital as the reason itself. For terms of personal contentment and personal inward satisfaction, it is probably paramount. The present writer has so contended in an article to which Professor Pratt’s book refers. But to properly estimate and give due weight to the feeling in religion, is not to abandon the reason. That very feeling itself must come under the critical scrutiny of the reason.

It is, however, when Professor Pratt comes to deal with this matter in relation to belief, that its utter inadequacy is best understood. Belief is itself a total of many elements; and a belief which did not have a rational basis, one grounded in reason, would soon disappear. It is doubtless true that many of the things which the present age has rejected have lost their rational force. It is doubtless a mistake, and a serious one, that some teachers are trying to force intellectual assent to things which cannot be rationally justified or even made reasonably attractive. But this is very far removed from the abandonment of the reason. And to imagine that a religion which rests upon unreasoning and unreasoned instincts can ever be in any real sense a religion is to ignore the history of religion entirely. It is here that Professor Pratt’s inadequacy to the subject appears. That the intuitions are to have a larger place than the prevailing philosophy allows them must be admitted. Indeed that is the great present need. But to suppose that this again involves the rejection of reason in religion is a very mistaken point of view. Professor Pratt seems to hold that belief is a thing which can be manufactured to order, and that it can be taken up or rejected according to will. Now the “will to believe” can do many and wonderful things. But for the most part it has been exhibited under conditions distinctly pathological. And this “will to believe” in practical operation is really, for the most part, a diseased state, which cannot be properly reckoned into any sound ex-

amination of religion. If Professor Pratt will look into the history of the Romantic School in Germany, and will go carefully into the lucubrations of the men like Tieck, Schlegel, Schleiermacher, and Hardenburg, especially the story of "Lucinde," both in the literature of the time and in real life, he will see what a sorry emergence the unchecked primacy of feeling produced. In fact the Danish critic Brandes discusses this very question in his chapter on "Romantic Duplication and Psychology," and this is his estimate: "Since the Ego is not an innate but an acquired conception, founded upon an association of ideas, which has to maintain itself against constant attacks of sleep, dreams, imaginations, hallucinations, and mental derangement, it is by its nature exposed to manifold dangers. Just as disease is ever lying in wait for our bodies, so madness lies in wait at the threshold of the Ego, and every now and again we hear it knock. It is of this correct psychological theory that the Romanticists, though they do not define it scientifically, nevertheless have a presentiment. Dreams, dipsomania, hallucinations, madness, all the powers which disintegrate the Ego, which disconnect its links, are their familiar friends. Read, for instance, Hoffmann's tale, 'The Golden Jar,' and you will hear voices issue from the apple-baskets, and the leaves and flowers of the elder-tree sing; you will see the door-knocker making faces, etc. We seem to see man's spiritual life spread and split itself up fan-wise into musical high and low spirits." We see Tieck, he says again, "composing dramas like so many puzzle-balls," and Kierkenggaard "fitting one author inside another in Chinese-box fashion on the strength of the theory that truth can only be imparted indirectly," and so on to the end of the chapter. And he adds, "The human being is only a group held more or less firmly together by association of ideas, and as a mind he is a complete whole; in his will all the elements of the mind are united." The simple truth is, that these men became priests of obscurantism in religion, in art, in literature, in everything they touched, but they furnish the finest examples known of the primacy, that is the unchecked primacy,

of feeling, to the debasement and abandonment of reason. These are the men who sneered and disparaged Lessing, Schiller, Goethe, and all the rest of the noble rational galaxy who have made Germany the nation of thinkers she is.

It would be quite unfair to give the impression that Professor Pratt does not see the possibility of these things, for he says that "the religion of feeling, in its calmer, more refined, more normal condition, must not be confused with its extremes and its excrescences." He knows that there have been pathological mystics; but what he does not seem clearly to perceive is that the moment the religion of feeling becomes supreme in the public thought, it instantly does go to extremes, and we have at once the very manifestations which he deplures. And every historical reaction from stiffness and sterility in the intellectual conception of religion which has accentuated the emotions has resulted in just the crudities and excrescences which Professor Pratt does not see are the usual concomitants of emotional religion. It is only when these reactions have been dealt with on their intellectual side, that reasoned advance has been made and religion has progressed. The emotional reactions have flared up and gone out; and, while some increment did result to the religious life, it was, as a rule, evanescent because it was not reasoned advance. The history of revivals shows this; and, where the advance is a sound one, it is merely the bringing up of an intellectual reserve which had not previously uttered itself publicly.

Professor Pratt's closing words about the absence of men from the churches are peculiarly wanting in full understanding of the problem. And it is hardly quite worthy of a Williams College professor to call the sale of Harnack's "*Wesen des Christenthums*" and Delitzsch's "*Babel und Bibel*" evidence of an "atmosphere laden with interest in religious questions." Harnack's book sold 60,000 copies and Delitzsch's 100,000, but Dr. William "Chloroform" Osler's "*Principles and Practice of Medicine*" sold, according to a trade report, over 105,000 copies! Does this indicate that the "psychological atmosphere" is laden with interest in medical

questions? On this theory, no feeling is necessary at all. We need only to get the trade reports of the best sellers! The reasons why men are not in the churches are many; and, if Professor Pratt will accept the results of a *questionnaire* which the present writer made some years ago in Boston in which replies were received from nearly five hundred men, he will probably be surprised when he is told that the cost figured in one form and another in three-fourths of the replies. The economics of church-going have not received the attention which they will receive sometime; and in the present industrial conditions and the prevailing economic system will be found the explanation of many things which Professor Pratt, with many others, seems to imagine are due to changed views of the Bible and religion. In fact, many years of a ministry, which has been peculiarly a ministry to and with and among men, has convinced the present writer that the intellectual changes have had the very least to do with the matter. As a rule the intellectual questions which have to do with faith and religion and their acceptance and rejection are discussed more freely in the churches than anywhere else. And of late many churches have themselves opened their own doors as a forum to their opponents. But this has not been the matter at all. In this review it is not the purpose to discuss that question, but it will suffice to say that Professor Pratt gives no intimations of knowing the elements of that question.

But he has written a book which is frank, straightforward, open, and without reserve. He states what he thinks with no appearance of dreading consequences or regret at having to leave behind something which he is sorry to lose. In short it is a true transcript of his heart as well as his mind, and therefore will be a book of influence, and will cause thinking concerning the problem which it discusses. As such it is to be welcomed. It will probably be true, as he says, that "spiritual insight will be recognized as the only sure basis of religious belief"; but spiritual insight will have to include history, historical evidence, the rise and determination of the norm of religious judgment and praxis, and the establishment of

standards which will create and maintain not mathematical but moral authority, which while not dictatorial will nevertheless in effect be final. Such authority will tend to be crystallized in objective symbols, the chief one for the Christian being the Bible. And while this, like all other symbols, will be but a symbol, subject to the correctional judgment, and conscience, and experience of the church, it will continue to represent substantially the final authority for the faith and practice of Christian men.

Salem, Mass.

A. A. BERLE.

THE "FOURTH DAY" IN GENESIS.

THE peculiarities of the "fourth day" in Genesis (i. 14-19) have often been wondered at, and various efforts have been made to explain them. For one thing, no life is mentioned. This, however, need occasion no difficulty. The life of the preceding period had perished at the beginning of this one, and the life of this period had likewise been blotted out long before man appeared on the earth. Some exceptions there were; but exceptions can be ignored in general statements. Working with a limited vocabulary and knowing nothing of these early forms of life, the author of Genesis could hardly be expected to improvise anything on the subject. These forms did not concern him. The renewal of life which took place in his "fifth day" did concern him, and he appears to have treated that part of his work with due accuracy. A concise popular general statement concerning creation is not the same thing as a modern geological treatise, and it is unfair to assume that it is, or to be too exacting about minor details. The author is therefore justified in omitting all mention of life. He confines his attention to a single astronomical change,—the completion of the present arrangement of the heavenly bodies with respect to the seasons, the days, and the nights. Some fundamental alteration in the solar system seems to be implied, and we know that it was a period of convulsions and cataclysms. Tracing the action of the tides back analytically, Sir George Darwin came to the conclusion a few years ago that the earth and the moon

were once a single pear-shaped body rotating in about five hours. Astronomy now confirms this hypothesis, as Dr. Lowell has recently shown;¹ for in no other way could the surface of the moon have obtained its present roughness, which indicates an amount of original heat out of all proportion to its mass. If it broke away from the earth after both were fairly cool, as present conditions seem to indicate; an explanation has been found for much more than the condition of the moon's exterior, since it may now be possible to account for the presence of so much land in the Northern Hemisphere, for the disturbances and heat which produced our mines of anthracite and graphite, for the fluctuations in the earth's crust which formed the mountains of this period, for the destruction of Paleozoic life, and in all probability for the strange inclination of the earth's axis to the plane of the ecliptic. Instead of contradicting the nebular hypothesis, then, as he has been accused of doing, Moses has met its deeper requirements in a most remarkable way. Present relations in the solar system cannot antedate the separation of the earth and the moon. They were impossible before that time. A five-hour period of rotation, if that supposition is correct, when combined with the other conditions of that remote day, would preclude all such seasons and time relations as we now have, and their establishment might easily be considered as the completion of the solar system. Although we know better, we still say that the sun rises and sets, and it behooves us to be reasonable. What we may well ask, is, How did Moses come to make such a statement at this particular point?

Cambridge, Mass.

H. W. MAGOUN.

A JEWISH TEMPLE IN EGYPT, B.C. 525-411.²

Great interest has been aroused among biblical scholars by the recent discovery of three Aramaic papyri found at Elephantinê, near the First Cataract of the Nile. They prove to have been written only twenty-four years after Nehemiah's

¹ *The Century*, Nov., 1907, pp. 122 ff.

² Condensed from an article by the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., in the *Guardian*, November 6, 1907.

second visit to Jerusalem (432 B.C.), and bring us nearer to the Old Testament than any inscription hitherto discovered. As Professor Driver remarks, "we are sensible, as we read them, of being in an atmosphere very similar to that into which we are brought by the Aramaic letters and edicts in Ezra vii. 11-26 (B.C. 458); iv. 11-16; 17-22 (shortly before B.C. 444); and even by the earlier ones of Ezra v. 6-17; vi. 2-12 (B.C. 520)." These "have just been published by Dr. Sachau, Professor of Semitic Languages, and Director of the Oriental Seminary, at Berlin (*Drei Aramäische Papyrus-urkunden aus Elephantine*, Berlin, 1907, with many valuable notes). These documents were found in a chamber of a house excavated from under the mound, which now marks the site of the ancient Elephantinê."

"The first of the papyri consists of thirty lines, written as the facsimile shows, in a clear and bold hand. It is a petition addressed by the colony of Jews at Elephantinê to Bagohi—the Bagoas of Josephus—the Persian Governor of Judah, to crave his intervention on their behalf. The 'temple of the God Yahu'—of course, Yahweh, or, in the pronunciation with which we are more familiar, Jehovah—in Elephantinê, in which they worshiped the God of their fathers, and to which they were intensely devoted, had, to their great sorrow, been destroyed; and they ask Bagohi's intervention and assistance to get it rebuilt. . . . From the description here given, it is evident that it was a substantial and handsome building, with pillars of stone, and seven stone gates. It was used not, like a synagogue, for prayer only, but also for sacrifice; it had an altar, upon which burnt-offerings, meal-offerings, and frankincense were regularly offered; mention is also made of gold and silver bowls, bearing the same name as those used in the Temple at Jerusalem, for tossing the sacrificial blood against the sides of the altar."

From the narrative it appears that the "Jewish colony had been settled in Elephantinê, and their Temple had been built there, for more than 120 years, from before the conquest of Egypt by Cambyes in B.C. 525. When Cambyes entered

Egypt, he observed the same goodwill towards the Jews there which his father Cyrus had shown towards the Jews of Babylon; the temples of the gods of Egypt had been destroyed by him, the temple of Jehovah had not been touched. But three years before the date of the petition, in 411, when Arsames—probably the Arxames, mentioned by Ctesias as Governor of Egypt when Darius II. became King (in 424)—had gone for some reason to the Persian Court, the priests of the ram-headed Egyptian god Chnub took advantage of his absence to bribe Waidrang, who was chief in command at Elephantinê, to destroy the Temple of the Jews. Waidrang . . . thereupon summoned his son, who was commander of the garrison in Syene, on the opposite side of the Nile; and he came with a body of troops, who ruthlessly destroyed the fabric of the Temple, and appropriated the gold and silver vessels, and other articles of value belonging to it, themselves. The Jews had at the time sent a letter to Bagohi, and also to Jehohanan (the Johanan of Neh. xii. 22), the high-priest at Jerusalem, and his brother Ostan or Anani, and the nobles of Judah, for assistance, but had received no reply. Since its destruction, naturally, no sacrifices could be offered in the Temple, and the Jews in their trouble had mourned and fasted and prayed to Yahu continuously. Their prayers had to some extent been answered, for some disaster had overtaken Waidrang, he had lost his possessions, the Egyptians who had wished evil against the Temple were slain, and the Jews (in Biblical phrase) had ‘seen their desire upon them.’

“The Temple, however, still remained in ruins, and the Jews had no permission to rebuild it. They pray Bagohi, therefore to send authority to Egypt enabling them to do this. And they promise, if he does so, to offer sacrifices in his name in the restored Temple, to pray for his welfare, and to grant him a fixed payment on all the sacrifices offered in it. They seem, however, to hint to Bagohi that they have arranged to make him a present for his good services (so Professor Sachau). They have also, they add, sent to interest Delaiah and Shelemiah, the sons of Sanballat, the Governor of

Samaria, the well-known opponent of Nehemiah, in their behalf. In conclusion, as if to remove any difficulty which Bagohi might feel in acting contrary to a colleague, they assure him that Arsam, the Persian Governor of Egypt, had no knowledge of what had been done to them." Their petition was successful.

"It is surprising to find that there was a Temple in Egypt in which sacrifice was offered for more than a hundred years. The famous Temple at Leontopolis, in the Delta, built by the high priest Onias III. between 170 and 160 B.C., after his deposition by Antiochus Epiphanes, in imitation of the Temple at Jerusalem, had a precedent which, till this discovery at Elephantinê, was entirely unsuspected. Who were the original founders of the colony at Elephantinê? Were they refugees of the Ten Tribes? Or were they Jews who had found a home in Egypt after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans in 586? The Jews in Egypt (including 'Pathros,' the 'Land of the South'—Upper Egypt) are severely denounced by Jeremiah (ch. xlv.) for their idolatry, and especially for their devotion to the Queen of heaven, and destruction is foretold for them; but there may have been some among them who were still faithful to the God of their fathers. Whatever the origin of the colony, which before 525 B.C. had penetrated 400 miles south of the modern Cairo, and established itself at Elephantinê, its members did not feel with their brethren in Palestine, or deem themselves bound by the law of Deuteronomy (ch. xii.), which prohibited sacrifice of every kind except at the Temple of Jerusalem. Professor Sayce has remarked that they could claim for their altar the sanction of Isaiah (xix. 19). It is, however, important to observe that the prophet's vision is not of a Jewish altar in Egypt in the midst of a heathen population, but gives expression to the loftier ideal of the devotion of the entire Egyptian people to Jehovah (see vv. 21, 23-25)."

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY IN OUTLINE. By WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, Ph.D., D.D. Pp. 468. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

It is no trifling task, as the world has been going, to produce a work on Christian theology and have it deal sympathetically and fairly both with the past and the present. And yet the theologian can have no real message and no excuse for writing in the present drift who is not modern, and certainly no less who has no deep insight into the permanent Christian values as these lie back in the historical treasures of the church. The strength and charm of Dr. Brown's book lie in its possessing in an unusual degree historical insight, breadth, and modernity. His knowledge of present thought has enabled him to deal with the fundamental and often puzzling questions of personal religion, philosophical speculation, and modern science in a way that is not only helpful but assuring; while his profound respect for the objective realities of religion is in striking contrast on one hand to those who see no need of readjustments, and on the other to those who see in the past only a series of worthless rubbish-heaps. The book is not at all dogmatic, but expository and analytical, an orderly summation of well-thought-out reasons presented in a faultlessly clear style. The result is one of the best books for the modern student that have yet appeared.

He makes six great divisions of his subject: The Postulates of Christian Theology; The Christian Idea of God; The Christian View of the World; Man and his Sin; Salvation through Christ; The Christian Life. An appendix, of 28 pages, contains a valuable classified Bibliography. A few brief quotations will show the poise and freshness of his work:—

"Systematic Theology is concerned only with the permanent elements in Christian truth. In determining what these are the systematic theologian finds his freedom. . . . The preparatory disciplines which affect Systematic Theology most directly are Biblical Theology, Symbolics, and History of Doctrine, since these give the form in which the Christian convictions have received systematic expression in the past The systematic theologian cannot go back of their results save as he himself becomes a historian or an exegete" (p. 5).

"The Christ of the New Testament is not simply the man of Nazareth, but the preëxistent Logos, the Word that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. Either one must be prepared to break with historic Christianity altogether and banish large parts of the New Testament from their place in our public worship, or else we must be able to give some rational account of the presence of the metaphysical element in early Christian theology and of its significance for the present life of the Church" (p. 158 f.).

"The insight that the God of redemption was at the same time the Creator assured the divineness of the present world, and so gave unity and consistency to Christian thought. The choice was not, as is often represented, between the Logos doctrine and simple faith, but between a philosophy which made the Christian God master of the world, and one which set the two side by side as rival powers" (p. 181).

"Creation affirms the real existence of the world for God; providence expresses its dependence upon him; miracle evidences its adaptation to the Christian God. . . . Any view of the origin and development of the Universe which is consistent with its dependence upon the Christian God and its adaptation to his purpose satisfies the requirement of Christian faith" (pp. 211, 213).

One is, however, surprised to find only three and a half pages given to the closing topic, The Christian View of the Final Consummation. But as nothing is said or implied of the possibility of a persistence in evil, as well as a perfecting of those who are progressing Godward, this may be space enough for this easy part of the subject. It is much more pleasant, if not exactly historical, to omit that very serious side of human destiny:—

"When all have come, through Christ, to the same knowledge and love of the Father which we see in him, then the goal of the Christian life will have been reached; so far as it is possible to speak of finality at all in a life which involves, both for the individual and for society, boundless possibilities of progress. The social consummation is that far-off divine event of which Paul speaks in 1 Corin-

thians xv. 28, when Christ, his mediatorial work complete, shall surrender his authority to the Father that God may be all in all" (p. 423).

But did Paul ever dream of setting aside the more explicit and decisive view which Christ himself gave of the Final Consummation as a double one?

ALBERT T. SWING.

UNBELIEF IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. A Critical History.
By HENRY C. SHELDON. Pp. 399. New York: Eaton & Mains. \$2.00, *net*.

From his position in Boston University, Professor Sheldon is doing for American thought a similar work to that done so admirably in their respective positions by Professor George P. Fisher and Dr. Philip Schaff. Professor Sheldon's previous contributions in the field of the external and the internal history of the church are filled out by this more specific treatise on the unbelief of the past hundred years. It is a subject worthy of the very best treatment, and Professor Sheldon's book is worthy of the subject. He is to be commended in that he has so successfully subordinated criticism to "compact and accurate exposition." The better day we have been looking for in the theological world seems to be coming. The book is immensely more valuable for this reason. This correct method has by no means interfered with, but made more forceful, the author's exceedingly valuable positive contribution to the Christian apologetic. He has rendered a service to broad scholarship, while establishing the grounds which are sane and reassuring against a decidedly radical trend in our modern world.

Although the book is primarily adapted for the student of theology, the author's clear and non-technical style will make the subjects easily understood by the general reader. It is a scholar's contribution to the great reading public, who in these days know none too much of the movements of thought of our own generation, and the historical sources out of which these have sprung. All will appreciate this list of writers,

the abundant extracts from them, and the author's calm but often pungent review to which these are here submitted. Whether his optimistic view of the general situation is entirely justifiable there may be some question. Many present trends are certainly ominous, and the early years of the twentieth century may see a greater shift from the early historical and evangelical basis before a saner and more scientific conservative reaction sets in. Professor Sheldon's clear and reassuring voice is not superfluous.

The first division of the book treats of Philosophical Theories,—of Radical Idealism; Sensationalism and Materialism; Positivism; Agnostic and Antitheistic Evolution; and of Pessimism. Part Second is devoted to Quasi-Scientific, Theological, and Ethical Theories. The book closes with a presentation of some of the most important Critical Theories,—of the Gospel Histories; of the Life of Jesus; and of the recent Radical Criticism of the Old and New Testaments.

ALBERT T. SWING.

HISTORY OF ENGLISH CONGREGATIONALISM. By R. W. DALE, D.D., LL.D. Completed and Edited by A. W. W. DALE. Pp. 787. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son. 1907. \$4.00, *net*.

Those who have awaited this book with large expectations will not be disappointed. Dr. Dale had given to this task the last years of his life, and had brought its main features almost to completion. The large amount of detail work remaining and the finishing touches have come from his son, A. W. W. Dale. The book is a worthy monument to the father and a credit to the scrupulous care and good judgment of the son. Especially does the service of the editor show itself in the fullness of the historical references which make the book an invaluable storehouse of information. In appreciation of his labors one can give full weight to his quiet remark that "easier access to the British museum would have saved many a wasted hour."

This book will do in a fuller sense for the history of English
Vol. LXV. No. 257. 12

and American Congregationalism what the labors of Dr. Dexter earlier had begun. One finds here ample recognition and use of the work of others, but yet the author goes his own way, and has his own independent judgment on all the interesting and sometimes intricate historical questions; as, e. g., the character of Robert Browne. The first division of the book is the shortest one, given to the statement of the Congregational conception of the church. Divisions two to four cover English Congregationalism under Elizabeth; from Elizabeth to the Restoration; and from the Restoration to the Revolution. Division five rounds out the subject to the death of George III. (1820). The concluding division (of 145 pages) brings the history down to 1891. While not graphically written, the facts and principles are so admirably stated that they blend into a story more fascinating than any novel to the student of modern religious history. The book is not only invaluable to the historical student, but should be in the hands of every layman who wishes an insight into the most significant movement in modern times,—the development of religious and political liberty.

A. T. S.

A SHORT HISTORY OF AMERICAN PRESBYTERIANISM, from its Foundations to the Reunion of 1869. Pp. 207. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work.

This is by no means a child's sketch, nor is it a systematic text-book. Its 207 pages are made up of three monographs of a decidedly mature nature, which are of value, as a comprehensive *résumé* of important movements, for students and intelligent laymen. The period from the founding of the Presbyterian Church in America to the outbreak of the Revolutionary War is covered by Dr. Alexander McGill of Princeton. The period of the Revolution to the Adoption of the Presbyterian Form of Government in 1786, is well presented by Professor Hopkins of Auburn Seminary. Dr. Wilson of Western Theological Seminary covers the ground from the "Adoption" to the Reunion of 1869.

RUDOLF EUCKEN'S PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE. By W. R. BOYCE GIBSON, Lecturer in Philosophy at the University of London. Second Edition. Pp. viii, 182. London: Adam and Charles Black. 1907. 3s. 6d., *net*.

It is far from complimentary to the British philosophic mind that it has been so painfully slow to discover the merits of a philosopher like Professor Eucken, of Jena. For there is not in the world to-day a more illuminated thinker, in certain important respects, than Eucken, as a very few of us long ago discovered. But the times of this ignorance are now passed, thanks to Mr. Gibson's painstaking and most admirable exposition. Within the limits he has set for himself, the work is astonishingly well done, as those who know Eucken's work at first-hand will be the first to appreciate. If we must be critical of one or two matters, it will only be after saying that his execution, in whole, can scarcely be too highly praised. He has done a very real service to English and American readers.

The work consists of ten chapters, in which "the new Idealism" is set forth and appraised by Mr. Gibson, who takes Eucken's philosophy as a rallying-point for all idealistic effort. In this it seems to me he is sanguine to a quite impossible degree. There is neither wisdom nor virtue in absurd expectations from those who are joined to the idols of Neo-Hegelian forms of idealism. One may as well know the philosophical world he lives in as any other, and be under no illusions. This does not make Eucken's system any the less meritorious. No attempt is here going to be made to follow so rich and suggestive a system; readers of the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA are referred to the work itself for such knowledge. But it is necessary to point out some of Eucken's chief claims to attention.

One of these is his disciplined knowledge of the history of philosophy, and another is his mental elevation. In this latter aspect he contrasts with many of our best dialecticians and discursive reasoners, whose work, moving mostly in the region of the senses and the understanding, often remains

but little illumined. That is to say, the higher insights of the soul—of a more than merely mental perception—are often in such thinkers painfully wanting. The merit of Eucken largely lies in the fact that he is so much more than merely intellectual in his cast of thought. His philosophical horizon has widened with his moral altitudes and spiritual ascents, and there are those among us who think the weakest side of modern philosophical writing lies in the direction just indicated. It is not in the least necessary—it is for many of us quite impossible—to accept Eucken's system *en bloc* in order to be able to appreciate him as he deserves. That man is not much of a philosopher who is to-day fond of espousing other people's systems, instead of thinking out his own relation to the world problems. And no culmination in "irrationalism" of any sort could be for us a satisfactory issue.

The parts of Mr. Gibson's work that have least favorably impressed me are, the first chapter and the appendix on "Activism." As to the former, it seems to me not a very wise or even fair thing to extract certain admissions of defect or incidentally inadequate treatment from a thinker, and set these in the foreground of an exposition before the system itself in its strength and symmetry has been shown. The discountings might surely have come later, after the thinker in his positive and worthwhile message had been introduced. In passing, I think Mr. Gibson exaggerates the loss to Eucken's teaching from lack of fuller attention to psychology. The defect is not disputed, but I doubt the extent of the loss, which the lack of a more concrete and functional treatment of consciousness has involved, as part of a somewhat fashionable tendency to-day to expect more at times from psychology than it can possibly yield. Once more: Mr. Gibson's exposition does not always hang very consistently together; for example (p. 18), he quotes approvingly a not specially lofty or illumined passage from a writer who says "the effective reformer must find his fulcrum for raising society in things as they are. He must live within the world if he is to make it better, and arm himself with its powers in order to conquer

it." Compare with that the passage on page 174: "It is hopeless, from the level of the given, to attempt any mutual adjustment of these opposing powers, for the standpoint from which to control the adjustment must lie beyond the given. Nothing can be controlled from a point on its own surface. Archimedes cannot move the world except from a fulcrum outside it," and further, "our only course is to . . . win our way slowly forwards and inwards beyond the given." Surely a "fulcrum" that must be inside and outside, at one and the same time, is in a bad way!

The Appendix on Eucken's philosophy as an "Activism" has excellent things in it, but despite all endeavors to maintain the independence of the spiritual life, we are left with an uneasy feeling that the tendency to subjectivism is so great as to leave no proper and adequate room for justice to the crass world of objective reality. Surely an idealistic system will always be judged by its way of dealing justly and adequately by the great facts of objectivity.

The work, however, is so rich, suggestive, and stimulating that it is cordially recommended to all readers interested in its great themes—freedom and the spiritual life.

Kilmarnock, Scotland.

JAMES LINDSAY.

THE RELIGIOUS CONCEPTION OF THE WORLD: An Essay in Constructive Philosophy. By ARTHUR KENYON ROGERS, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy in Butler College; author of "A Brief Introduction to Modern Philosophy," "A Students' History of Philosophy." 8vo. Pp. v, 285. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1907. \$1.50, *net*.

It is refreshing to find a competent authority in philosophy who at the outset proposes "to defend a view of the world which is frankly religious and theistic, in opposition to certain modern types of philosophical thought which are now widely prevalent" (p. 1). The chapters in the Essay treat consecutively of "The Foundations of Knowledge," "The Validity of Knowledge," "Religion and Philosophy," "The Argument for Purpose," "The Relation of God and Nature," "The Problem of Freedom," "The Problem of Evil," and "The Problem of Immortality."

The chapter upon "The Validity of Knowledge" admirably disposes of the agnostic theory that nothing can be known outside the limits of human experience. "Some positive knowledge is necessary in order to give us grounds for saying what a thing is *not*. . . . There is a vast difference between not knowing that a thing is, and not knowing that a thing is not" (p. 39). In the chapter upon "The Relation of God and Nature" the author argues well, that, since we know our own personality through consciousness, it may be inferred that consciousness is a something which has always existed. "There is no other reality that we know so well. . . . It affords therefore really the only type of hypothesis positive in its nature that is available" (p. 135). The volume has more than temporary value.

JESUS CHRIST AND THE CIVILIZATION OF TO-DAY. The Ethical Teaching of Jesus considered in its Bearings on the Moral Foundation of Modern Culture. By JOSEPH ALEXANDER LEIGHTON, Ph.D. Pp. 248. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1907. \$1.50, *net*.

This book is distinctly modern, being a fresh philosophical treatment of a subject of vital import. It is not only full of suggestive thought, but it shows a real insight into the ethics of the gospel on one side, and the significance of human life and its deepest problems on the other. It is really a new apologetic from the practical point of view of psychology and sociology, and the author may be said not only to have scored a point, but to have given a vigorous and up-to-date piece of writing. To use his own words in defining his task, "No better test can be made of the permanent worth of the gospel of Jesus than that of determining how it bears on the moral and spiritual problems of life to-day." He very well says that no system of morality can be derived from the fact of the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence, for "morality does not begin until we leave the realm of mere brute force and judge in terms of ideal worth or value." And he states very clearly the problem of modern ethics when he says that "the ethical antithesis now stands between biological

egoism and Christian altruism." "The natural cosmos revealed by science appears in its movement to be coldly and blindly indifferent, if not actually hostile, to moral endeavor, and the moral and social achievements of mankind seem to have been wrought out in the very teeth of this inhuman natural order. . . . Either we must go forward to a solution of the antithesis, or the moral endeavor of mankind must seem an irrational eruption in a non-moral universe" (p. 25).

Chapter IX., on Jesus Christ and other Founders of Religions, is one of the strongest chapters of the book. It gives an admirable summation of orientalism, and shows very conclusively that Christianity has nothing to fear and little enough to learn from those older isms. This is just now refreshing reading when certain well-known lecturers are trying to set in motion an undercurrent of appreciation for classic Brahminism and Buddhism.

A. T. S.

ESSAYS IN PASTORAL MEDICINE. By AUSTIN O'MALLEY, M.D., Ph.D., LL.D., and JAMES J. WALSH, M.D., Ph.D., LL.D. New York City: Longmans, Green & Company. 1906.

Written for the information and guidance of Roman Catholic priests and physicians, these essays discuss numerous questions which lie, as it were, upon the border-line between medicine and theology. Notwithstanding religious differences, ministers of all denominations will find much in them that will prove very useful, especially when they are confronted with those spiritual maladies which depend more or less upon physical weakness or disease, a field of pastoral work not over-zealously cultivated by the regular ministry, as the growth of Christian Science and similar cults bears witness. The information given is very full and quite in accord with the latest teachings of Science, though the latter is kept sternly in her place as the humble handmaid of Religion.

The tremendous importance attached by Catholics to infant baptism, its omission according to that church debarring forever from perfect happiness in the next world, raises several interesting questions, the answers to which by the

church show the powerful hold it still has upon the physical as well as upon the spiritual life of its adherents. For instance, when the lives of mother and child are in mortal danger from the perils of child-birth, and it is possible to save one only by the sacrifice of the other, Catholics unhesitatingly sacrifice the mother if that is necessary to secure the baptism of the child, whereas among Protestants it is the rule to sacrifice the child. With regard to some of the expedients advised for baptizing an unborn child, it is easy enough to ridicule them, after the manner of Sterne in "*Tristram Shandy*," but no one who has ever seen the grief of a Catholic mother over the death of her unbaptized child can treat the subject with mockery. Our own views of the uncovenanted mercies of God are none too bright. As our readers know, in an emergency, when the services of a priest are not at hand, any man, woman, or child, Catholic or Protestant, may baptize the child of Catholic parents, and the ceremony is valid, provided water has been used and the essential words spoken.

In the chapter on "*Human Terata and the Sacraments*" the baptism of monstrosities is discussed, and some curious questions are gravely propounded. When a child is born with part of another body attached to it, how large must the part be to possess a soul of its own, and thus require separate baptism? The child with two faces, for example, has it one or two souls? The possibility of the marriage of some of them being bigamous is also considered. Formerly there seems to have been doubt whether all these misshapen creatures were human: perhaps the doubt still exists, for a conditional form of baptism is given: "*Si tu es homo, ego te baptizo*," etc.

The essays on the problems of heredity deserve very careful consideration, as statements are not infrequently made in the pulpit as to the sins of the fathers being visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation, which not only have no clear scientific warrant, but are opposed to the later and balancing declaration of Ezekiel: "*The soul that sinneth it shall die; the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father.*"

When the fathers eat sour grapes, it does not always follow that the children's teeth are set on edge.

Various mental disorders are well described, so that ministers can be on their guard against those disturbers of the peace of the church, the neurasthenics, hysterics, cranks, paranoiacs, and others with minds more or less unbalanced.

Practical advice is given to the minister for his protection when visiting cases of contagious disease, and for the administration of the sacraments to them. Catholics avoid one source of danger, the common use of the communion cup. Certainly in cases of small-pox, diphtheria, and similar very infectious diseases, the use by Protestant ministers of separate communion cups is advisable. Missionaries and the country clergy may find the directions for the prevention and control of infectious disease among school-children very useful.

Altogether, the range of subjects covered is very wide, including Ectopic Gestation; Abortion; Miscarriage and Premature Labour; the Cæsarean Section and Craniotomy; Human Terata in reference to Baptism; Heredity, Physical Disease and Moral Weakness; Certain Aspects of Intoxication; Social Medicine; Hypnotism; Suggestion and Crime; the Exact Moment of Death; School Hygiene; Criminology and the Habitual Criminal; Paranoia, a Study in "Cranks"; Suicides; Syphilis and Marriage; Social Diseases; Impotency in the Male and Female; Neurasthenia; Hysteria; Menstrual Diseases; Disease and Responsibility; Epilepsy and Responsibilities; Impulse and Responsibility; besides many other topics of great interest, such as Bloody Sweat.

E. M. M.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE SOCIAL CRISIS. By WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH, Professor of Church History in Rochester Theological Seminary. 8vo. Pp. xv, 429. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.75, *net*.

The author of this impassioned and helpful volume was for years a pastor "among the working people on the West Side of New York City," and hence has obtained a basis for sympathy with working people which few writers possess. Naturally his volume presents in vivid colors the drawbacks

to our boasted civilization which appear in the strained relations between capitalists and working people, and he foresees the ultimate decay of our present civilization,—such as overtook that of the Roman Empire, and for very similar causes,—unless the spirit of Christianity can in some way counteract the tendencies. For relief the author looks to the growth of communistic and socialistic organizations permeated with the Christian spirit, but warns them against the introduction of the ecclesiastical spirit. But it is difficult to fix upon any particular form of effort which shall serve as a perfect panacea. The best he can say is:—

“If the Church truly desires to save the social life of the people, it must be content with inspiring the social movement with religious faith and daring, and it must not attempt to control and monopolize it for its own organization. If a man wants to give honest help, he must fill himself with the spirit of Jesus and divest himself of the ecclesiastical point of view” (p. 348).

THE CHURCH AND THE CHANGING ORDER. By SHAILER MATHEWS, Professor of Historical and Comparative Theology in the University of Chicago; author of “The Social Teaching of Jesus,” “The Messianic Hope in the New Testament.” 8vo, Pp. viii, 255. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1907. \$1.50, *net*.

This volume is a wholesome tonic in this age of decaying faith. With rare skill and force the author presents the fact that Christianity is an historical religion, and not a mere system of ethics.

“... If the ultraconservative wing of the church is in danger of neglecting the formative intellectual forces of the time, the liberal wing is quite as much in danger of forgetting that it has a gospel of facts and hope” (p. 48).

“... You look to the Sermon on the Mount for ideals, but you do not look to it for power to help realize those ideals” (p. 49).

“... Take away the historical, risen Jesus, and you take away the gospel in its original sense. And you change the definition of Christianity itself. For Christianity as the embodiment of the gospel is a phase of religion determined by historical facts and conditions” (p. 52).

“... It is imperative that we recognize the fact that the section of the church which is really being influenced by to-day’s philosophical and scientific thought is moving pretty rapidly toward a concep-

tion of the gospel different from that which we find in the New Testament" (pp. 53-54).

Professor Mathews's outspoken words will do much to counteract the suspicions which many have cherished towards the theological seminary of Chicago University.

THE ANCESTRY OF OUR ENGLISH BIBLE: An Account of the Bible Versions, Texts, and Manuscripts. By IRA MAURICE PRICE, Ph.D., Professor of the Semitic Languages and Literatures in the University of Chicago. 8vo. Pp. xxiv, 330. Philadelphia: The Sunday School Times Company. 1907. \$1.50, *net*.

The larger part of this volume is devoted to giving a popular account of the texts and versions from which our English translations have been made. This part is an excellent summary of the principles of textual criticism; while the treatment of the English translations and the bibliography are all that can be desired for popular use.

THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS IN PARABLES. By Rev. GEORGE HENRY HUBBARD. 8vo. Pp. xxiii, 507. Boston, New York, Chicago: The Pilgrim Press. \$1.50, *net*.

Thirty-eight parables receive treatment in this admirable book, the plan of which may be inferred from the author's definition of the word and his statement of principles of interpretation: "A parable is a word picture" (p. xvi); "The essential truth of a parable is that which lies plainly upon its surface. Any other truths which we may draw from it are merely incidental, and have no basis of Christly authority. The lesson of every parable is that which appears as readily to the mind of a child as to that of the mature and careful scholar" (p. xviii).

GOSPEL DEVELOPMENT: A Study of the Origin and Growth of the Four Gospels, by Mutual Comparison. In Two Divisions: I. Comparison in Language; II. Comparison in Subject. By the Rev. CALEB THEOPHILUS WARD, M.A. 8vo. Pp. xiv, 404. Brooklyn, N. Y.: Synoptic Publication Company. 1907. \$2.00.

The preparation of this volume has involved an immense

amount of faithful and painstaking work, which brings together very fully the facts upon which the author theorizes with relation to the origin and growth of the four Gospels. The typographical devices by which these facts are presented to the eye are as satisfactory as it would be possible to have without using different colors; but they are so numerous as to be at first somewhat confusing. This, however, is inevitable where the typographical key contains twelve combinations. No other single volume contains such a complete analysis of the Gospels, and comparison of their similarities and dissimilarities, as does this. Out of it all the author concludes that

"our present Four Gospels are the result of a growth and development extending over a period of probably two hundred years. Beginning with the first attempt of Matthew to make a collection of our Lord's sayings, and ending with the collation of copies by Origen for his commentaries on the Gospels, these noble works seem to have benefited from the best minds of the primitive Church. How much was due to their original authors, and how much was gradually added from time to time is beyond our power to determine. That the Gospels in their present form are not identical with their earliest condition is evident on the smallest research. That they have undergone many and material changes has been proved beyond doubt" (p. 389).

In coming to this conclusion it is evident that the author overestimates the extent of the changes and additions which it is reasonable to believe could be made in early documents regarded as so sacred as these were. Moreover, he is more positive than the facts warrant in assigning the date of all the Gospels to the period following the destruction of Jerusalem. If anything is clear from internal evidence it is that the synoptic Gospels were all substantially put into shape and fixed in their form before the destruction of Jerusalem. With the exception of the prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, there is not a hint that would betray a knowledge of the conditions prevailing in Palestine after that event. If internal evidence can prove anything, the language of the synoptic Gospels was stereotyped before that disastrous tragedy which forever swept away the institutions of the old dispensation.

ANCIENT MASTERS AND JESUS. By WILLIAM B. HARTZOG, Ph.D. 8vo. Pp. 256. Cleveland, Ohio: The German Baptist Publication Society.

This is a helpful volume, the result of wide reading and profound study, showing how all the lines of classic philosophy and literature lead up to the effulgent revelation found in the person of Christ.

TENT AND TESTAMENT: A Camping Tour in Palestine, with Some Notes on Scripture Sites. By HERBERT RIX, B.A. 8vo. Pp. xiii, 312. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; London: Williams and Norgate. 1907. \$2.50, *net*.

A prominent excellence of this book is found in its admirable illustrations of scenes and places from actual photographs. Of these there are no less than sixty-three. The volume will make an excellent guide-book either to the traveler or the home reader.

A SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURES OF MODERN EUROPE. By MARIAN EDWARDS. Pp. xvi, 532. London: J. M. Dent and Co. 1907. 7s. 6d., *net*.

The Literatures of Europe embraced in this learned and comprehensive work are those of England, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain, and the work is brought up to the year 1400. Primarily of a literary interest, it has yet many points of religious contact, both in prose and verse. The author deserves the utmost credit for the learning, skill, and care with which the work has been executed. Small points of omission or of unexpected treatment there must be, of course, in such a work; but these need not keep us from appreciating the excellence of the work in whole, which is one of great convenience and value. The Bibliographies are very select, but are supplemented by useful Lists of General Authorities.

One hundred and forty-two pages are devoted to the English section, which is, in the main, quite satisfactory. But it seems odd that the General Authorities should here be so largely German; surely the English list might easily have been supplemented.

In the French section, we miss a name or two we should have expected in the authorities, but the list is a good one, though brief. The account of the rise of French Literature has been found careful and very well-informed, an excellent balance being here maintained also.

The authorities in the section on German Literature are naturally almost entirely German. The account of the German literary origins is succinct and clear, and, when the period of Old High German has been usefully disposed of, we are brought to Otfried as, of course, the first great landmark in the poetic development. Thence the literary developments are traced, from the ninth to the fourteenth century, with the same scholarship and care that marked the previous sections.

The Italian portion of the work is based mainly on Italian authorities, Garnett's work being the only English one mentioned. The section properly begins by noting that "Italian was the latest developed of the Romance languages, and that there is no work extant to indicate that it was used for literary purposes before the beginning of the 13th century (cir. 1220)." The literary development is again carefully worked out. Occasionally there is a statement somewhat too general to be accurate; as when, for example, it is said of Petrarch that, "unlike Dante," he was "not an encourager of vernacular literature." This overlooks what Petrarch did in completing the work of Dante in respect of creating the Italian language, and that it was precisely his own project of writing in the vulgar tongue that made him abstain from study of Dante. These things hold good, even though the irony of fate has been to make his own prized Latinity forgotten before his Italian poetry. Occasionally, too, a description is slightly wanting in definiteness of statement. That of Petrarch is an example, and may be taken as we have been speaking of him. The description is good, and yet scarcely satisfactory. A sentence from Garnett is eulogistic enough, and correct too, but it is not illuminating. The terms are too general. If Petrarch was father of Italian lyrical poetry; if he was real restorer of polite letters—restorer of Latinity, and promoter of Greek; if

he was patriot and lover of science as well as poet and romantic; these things could all have been said in ways more definite, expressive, and likely to remain in a reader's memory.

The Spanish Literature section is *multum in parvo*, and is interesting and excellent. Raymond Lully, whom competent writers have sometimes styled the most brilliant Catalan writer of the Middle Ages, and Isidore of Seville are, we are glad to see, noticed, but Prudentius and some others are not.

The work is interesting to readers of the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, not merely from a literary point of view, but also for its many interesting notices of religious works, both prose and verse.

One can scarcely praise too highly the learning, care, ability, and industry, of this most valuable work. J. L.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia.

CHRISTIAN AGNOSTICISM, as related to Christian Knowledge.

By E. H. JOHNSON, D.D., LL.D., late Professor of Systematic Theology in the Crozer Theological Seminary, and author of "An Outline of Systematic Theology," "The Religious Use of Imagination," "The Highest Life," and "The Holy Spirit—Then and Now." Edited, with a Biographical Sketch and an Appreciation, by HENRY C. VEDDER. 12mo. Pp. xxxii, 302. \$1.00.

CHRIST AND BUDDHA. By JOSIAH NELSON CUSHING, Ph.D., Missionary for Forty Years in Burma, late President of the Rangoon College. With an Appreciation of the Author by HENRY MELVILLE KING, Pastor Emeritus of the First Baptist Church in Providence, R. I. 12mo. Pp. 160. 75 cents.

FORMATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By GEORGE HOOPER FERRIS. 12mo. Pp. 281. 90 cents, *net*.

THAT BLESSED HOPE, the Second Coming of Christ. Considered with Special Reference to Post-Millennial and Pre-Millennial Discussions. Also an Appendix treating of Related Topics. By DAVID HEAGLE, Ph.D., D.D., Translator of the "Bremen Lectures," author of "Moral Education," etc. 12mo. Pp. 176. 75 cents.

The American Tract Society, New York.

THE LORD OF GLORY: A Study of the Designations of our Lord in the New Testament with Special Reference to his Deity. By BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary. 8vo. Pp. 332. \$1.50, *net*.

PROGRESS OF DOCTRINE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. Considered in Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford on the Bampton Foundation. By THOMAS DEHANY BERNARD, of Exeter College, Rector of Walcot and Canon of Wells. 8vo. Pp. 244. \$1.25.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS CONCERNING HIS OWN PERSON. (The Teachings of Jesus.) By WAYLAND HOYT, LL.D. 12mo. Pp. x, 200. 75 cents.

A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

POSITIVE PREACHING AND MODERN MIND. By P. T. FORSYTH, M.A., D.D. The Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching, Yale University, 1907. 8vo. Pp. xii, 374. \$1.75, *net*.

Henry Frowde, London.

OLD TESTAMENT PROBLEMS: Critical Studies in the Psalms and Isaiah. By JAMES WILLIAM THIRTLE, LL.D., D.D., Member of the Royal Asiatic Society; author of "The Titles of the Psalms." 8vo. Pp. viii, 336. \$2.40.

The Macmillan Company, New York.

THE CHRIST THAT IS TO BE. By the Author of "Pro Christo et Ecclesia." 8vo. Pp. xvii, 385. \$1.50, *net*.

THE MODERN READER'S BIBLE: The Books of the Bible with Three Books of the Apocrypha, presented in Modern Literary Form. Edited, with Introductions and Notes. By RICHARD G. MOULTON, M.A. (Camb.), Ph.D., Professor of Literary Theory and Interpretation in the University of Chicago. 8vo. Pp. xiv, 1732. \$2.00, *net*.

LIFE IN THE HOMERIC AGE. By THOMAS DAY SEYMOUR, Hillhouse Professor of the Greek Language and Literature in Yale University. 8vo. Pp. xvi, 704. \$4.00, *net*.

The Pilgrim Press, Boston.

INFINITE AFFECTION. By CHARLES S. MACFARLAND, author of "The Spirit Christlike," etc. 12mo. Pp. 174. \$1.00, *net*.

PEASANTRY OF PALESTINE: The Life, Manners, and Customs of the Village. By ELIHU GRANT, B.D., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Biblical Literature at Smith College. 8vo. Pp. 254. \$1.50, *net*.

THE TEACHER THAT TEACHES. By AMOS R. WELLS, Managing Editor of the *Christian Endeavor World*. 12mo. Pp. 95. 60 cents, *net*.

THE RECORDS OF THE PAST

PARTIAL CONTENTS—Volume VI., 1907.

- Climate and History in Western Asia (5 Illustrations). By E. Cutler Shedd.
Development of the System of Boundary Fortifications in Britain and Germany
under the Roman Empire. By George H. Allen.
Troglydyte Dwellings of Bakhtchi-Sarai (11 Illustrations). By G. Frederick Wright.
The McEvers Mounds, Pike County, Ill. (2 Illustrations). By Clara K. Bayliss.
The Nebraska Loess Man (5 Illustrations). By Robert F. Gilder.
Ancient Inhabitants of Nebraska (5 Illustrations). By Erwin H. Barbour.
Roman North Africa (8 Illustrations). By C. Densmore Curtis.
Prehistoric Man in Nebraska. By E. E. Blackman.
Mound Builders of the Mississippi Valley (7 Illustrations). By Richard Herrmann.
Palestine Exploration Fund. By Theodore F. Wright.
A Primitive Cattle Shrine in Asia Minor (3 Illustrations). By George E. White.
Nehawka Flint Quarries (6 Illustrations). By E. E. Blackman.
The Autobiographic Element in Latin Literature and Inscriptions (5 Illustrations). By Henry H. Armstrong.
Site of Ancient Persepolis (4 Illustrations). By Thomas F. Nelson.
Preserving Wisconsin Mounds (2 Illustrations). By Frank A. Flower.
Pre-Indian Inhabitants of North America (16 Illustrations). By Newton H. Winchell.
Work of the Ohio Archaeological Society.
Ancient Pottery Furnaces. By Frank A. Flower.
Lead Furnaces. By W. M. F. Petrie.
Soul-Houses in Egypt (8 Illustrations). By A. L. Kroeber.
Relics of the Stone Age from Taltal, Chile.
Archæological Work of the University of California. By Eunice G. Allyn.
Amber in Asia. By Edmund von Mach.
The Evolution of the Greek Fret (8 Illustrations). By Count Maurice de Perigny.
Greek Draped Figure at Vassar (6 Illustrations). By Charles De W. Brower.
Maya Ruins in Quintana Roo. By George E. White.
The Swastika. By St. John Seymour.
The Hittite Capital, Boghaz-keuy and its Environs (12 Illustrations). By Edward W. Clark.
New Light on Babylonian Chronology.
The Rock of Cashel (4 Illustrations). By Luella A. Owen.
Interdependent Evolution of Oases and Civilizations. By Edmund von Mach.
Egyptian Research Account. By Albert T. Clay.
An Archæological Tour through Sicily with a Camera (22 Illustrations). By Edmund von Mach.
The Beginnings of Iron. By Frederick Bennett Wright.
A Palæolithic Implement from the Loess (2 Illustrations).
Roman Portrait Head in Vassar College (6 Illustrations).
The Liver in Babylonian Divination (5 Illustrations).
Adolf Furtwangler.
Huntington's "Explorations in Central Asia" (5 Illustrations).

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History

BY G. FREDERICK WRIGHT, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A.

PRESS NOTICES

"One of the most thorough books of its kind, in a popular form, lately published."—*New York Times*, Jan. 26, 1907.

"If certain recent utterances have created the impression in the public mind that religion is hopelessly unscientific, Dr. G. Frederick Wright's extremely interesting and able volume, 'Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History,' should suffice to remove it. . . . His book may be confidently recommended to all who are interested in the subject." *Providence Journal*, Jan. 6, 1907.

"If the destructive critics and the skeptics who attack the Old Testament were only open to argument, this book would settle the question for them. . . . The last chapter is the best discussion of its subject we have seen. The whole book is strengthening and even inspiring. Whoever would be posted should get this admirable work."—Dr. T. T. EATON, *Western Recorder*, Feb. 28, 1907.

"He is very happy in his style of telling us what he has seen, and why he interpreted it as he does, and what is the bearing of his work on the Bible. The volume bids fair to be recognized as the standard work on the important subject of Pentateuchal physics; just as explorations of the ruins of Chaldea, Assyria, and Egypt have enlightened us as to Old Testament historicity."—Dr. G. MACLOSKIE, *Princeton Review*, April, 1907.

Its twelve chapters are entitled:

- I...The Witness of the New Testament.
- II...Middle and Later Jewish History.
- III...Israel in Egypt.
- IV...The Exodus.
- V...Physical Preparation for Israel in Palestine.
- VI...Traditions of the Deluge.
- VII...Scientific Credibility of the Deluge.
- VIII...The Glacial Epoch as a *Vera Causa*.
- IX...Evidences of a Deluge in Europe.
- X...The Evidence of a Deluge in Asia.
- XI...The Deluge in North America.
- XII...The First Chapter of Genesis, and Modern Science.

Cloth, 12mo, 450 pages, \$2.00 net
\$2.15 postpaid

Bibliotheca Sacra for 1908 and "Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History" will be sent postpaid for \$4.25

**Bibliotheca
Sacra Company**

OBERLIN, OHIO

ANY ONE SENDING US A PERFECT COPY OF THE NUMBER FOR JANUARY, 1895, OR APRIL OR OCTOBER, 1899, WILL BE CREDITED FOR ANY TWO NUMBERS OF 1908.

SEVENTY-EIGHTH YEAR.

JUN 23 1908

APRIL, 1908.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly

EDITOR

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

ASSOCIATED WITH

FRANK H. FOSTER, D. W. SIMON, JAMES LINDSAY, HUGH M. SCOTT,
CHARLES F. THWING, NEWELL DWIGHT HILLIS, A. A. BERLE,
WILLIAM E. BARTON, WILLIAM EDWARDS PARK,
HENRY A. STIMSON.

CONTENTS

WHITTIER THE MAN, POET, AND REFORMER.	F. B. Sanborn.	193
"SUFFER LITTLE CHILDREN TO COME UNTO ME."	Hugh K. Wagner.	214
RISE OF THE TOLERATION MOVEMENT.	Franklin C. Clark.	249
UNIVERSITIES AND SOCIAL ADVANCE.	A. A. Berle.	306
CAN SECULARISM DO IT?	William Harrison.	331
FALSE BIOLOGY AND FATALISM.	John T. Gulick.	358
NOTES.		368
THE POVERTY AND VICE OF LONDON.		368
USE AND ABUSE OF APOLOGETICS. ,	Abraham Kuypers.	374
THEOLOGICAL UNREST IN ENGLAND.		379
THE REMOVAL OF ANDOVER SEMINARY. William Edwards Park.		386
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.		388

OBERLIN, OHIO, U. S. A.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

EUROPEAN AGENTS, CHARLES HIGHAM & SON, LONDON.

SINGLE NUMBER, 75 CENTS.

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.00.

Scientific Confirmations OF Old Testament History

By G. FREDERICK WRIGHT
D.D., LL.D., F. G. S. A.

PROFESSOR OF THE HARMONY OF SCIENCE AND REVELATION IN OBERLIN COLLEGE; AUTHOR
OF "THE LOGIC OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES," "SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS OF
CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES," "THE ICE AGE IN NORTH AMERICA,"
"MAN AND THE GLACIAL PERIOD," ETC.

"The title of this work is fully justified by its learned contents. No thoughtful mind—no sincere searcher for the truth—can give due consideration to the vast accumulation of scientific facts arranged by the author in this volume and fail to be confirmed in a belief of the accuracy of the historical statements of the Old Testament. It is a marvelous unfolding of the geological events of the post-Tertiary period, well calculated to incite the general reader to a closer study of its significant and overwhelming facts, which invite investigation on every hand. The discussion is also eminently worthy of the attention of geologists, many of whom, the author observes, are so engrossed in their particular studies that they have little leisure or inclination to consider the action of geological forces in their more general application. . . . We consider Dr. Wright's book a most valuable contribution to the literature of scientific Bible defence, and wish for it a very wide circulation."—*English Churchman*.

"The facts brought to light are of supreme interest, and may modify some of the conclusions of Old Testament criticism."—*British Congregationalist*.

"The most important part of the book is undoubtedly the extended treatment from chaps. vi. to xi. of the Biblical account of the Noachian Deluge in its relation to the facts of science. Here the author writes on a subject in relation to which he has first-hand knowledge and is an admitted expert, and the mass of facts he accumulates from all parts of the globe seem to prove beyond dispute the reality of a great catastrophe after or in connection with the close of the glacial period, which swept away the forms of life then existing, and made a complete break between older and newer man."—JAMES ORR, D.D., *Homiletic Review*.

"The book is of interest because it shows how wonderfully the account given of Creation in Genesis harmonises with scientific data in regard to the different stages of creation and evolution. . . . While Dr. Wright speaks with authority on geological problems, and is inclined to invoke the aid of geology in restoring traditional opinions, he is by no means indifferent to the fact that the Bible contains philosophy, poetry, history, drama, and that learned men have held opinions entirely different from his own. The book is one of much instruction and interest."—*Dublin Express*.

The Bibliotheca Sacra Co.

OBERLIN, OHIO.

Studies in Biblical Law

BY

HAROLD M. WIENER, *M.A., LL. B.*

OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
FORMERLY A SENIOR WHEWELL SCHOLAR OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

"As a whole, these 'Studies' are of unusual worth. They accomplish for certain Old Testament themes what Greenleaf, Lyttleton, and West did in New Testament lines . . . no one will doubt that the author has attempted a most important task and has succeeded well. He has done much to clear the atmosphere where there was overmuch fog. The work deserves to be well known among all students of the older part of God's Word."—*Review and Expositor*.

"It is bold and refreshing . . . our writer goes over ground trodden nearly two thousand years ago by the sages of the Mishnah; but he strikes out in his own line and stands forth much more logical than the old Pharisaic doctors."—*New York Evening Post*.

"There is no doubt that in this examination of the Biblical jurial laws Mr. Wiener has opened up a new and valuable source of information as to the dates of the various books of the Pentateuch."—*Academy*.

" . . . both moral and interesting. . . The method employed is an ingenious and skillful application of the principles of legal interpretation to texts in apparent conflict."—*Harvard Law Review*.

"In the simplest and quietest way, though with a very firm grasp of the subject, the author shows the impossibilities, and in some cases the real absurdities, of certain contentions of modern criticism; and in our judgment he clearly convicts the writers . . . referred to of sacrificing reality and common-sense to matters of philological theory. . . We recommend this volume to the careful attention of our readers."—*Churchman* (London).

"Altogether the volume is one of great importance and value."—*Bibliotheca Sacra*.

LONDON : DAVID NUTT
57-59 LONG ACRE

Among other notable contributions during 1908

The Hibbert Journal

A QUARTERLY REVIEW OF RELIGION, THEOLOGY
AND PHILOSOPHY

**Will Contain Special Articles and Series
of Articles as follows:**

THE RELIGION OF SENSIBLE MEN. First, "The Religion of Sensible Scotsmen," by William Wallace, LL.D., of Glasgow, will appear in January,—to be followed by "The Religion of Sensible Americans," by David Starr Jordan, in April.

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, begun in July, 1907, by Professor Royce of Harvard, will be continued by Sir Oliver Lodge, and Professor Rudolf Eucken of Jena.

MODERNISM IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. To the January issue, Father George Tyrrel contributes "The Prospects of Modernism," and Father John Gerrard, S. J., "The Papal Encyclical: From a Catholic's Point of View." The question of the Catholic system in relation to American ideals and American institutions will be dealt with by distinguished American writers.

THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE EASTERN AND WESTERN RACES COMPARED. The validity of Christian experience will be discussed, and the claims of the recognition of the East considered. Various distinguished Indian and Japanese writers will take part in the discussion.

PRAGMATISM. Separate articles will appear, dealing with American and British exponents of this school of thought. Among them will be Professor McGilvary, of the University of Wisconsin, Professor Henry Jones of Glasgow, and the Editor of THE HIBBERT JOURNAL.

NEW TYPES OF RELIGION IN THE WESTERN WORLD. Christian Science, Theosophy, and other new sects will be candidly and impartially examined.

EDUCATION, especially in its connection with religious and ethical ideals. American, British, and European writers will contribute.

A GENERAL REVIEW OF THE COURSE OF AMERICAN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT *as Revealed by the Publications of the Year.* By Professor A. O. Lovejoy of Washington University, St. Louis.

Annual Subscription, \$2.50. Single Copies, 75 Cents

SUBSCRIPTIONS MAY BEGIN WITH ANY NUMBER

Sherman, French & Company
SIX BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Latest "Open Court" Publications

AVESTA ESCHATOLOGY, compared with the Books of Daniel and Revelation. By Lawrence H. Mills. 85 pp. Boards. Price 50c. Extra edition, Strathmore paper, gilt top. Price 75c.

THE MESSIANIC HOPE OF THE SAMARITANS. By Jacob, Son of Aaron, High Priest of the Samaritans. Edited with an introduction by William Eleazar Barton. Price 25c.

Religions: Ancient and Modern

The Series is intended to present to a large public the salient features of the GREAT RELIGIONS of the Human Race. The Volumes already published have met with most gratifying appreciation.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, 40 cents net per volume

NOW PUBLISHED

ANIMISM. By Edward Clodd.

PANTHEISM. By James Allanson Picton.

CELTIC RELIGION. By Professor Anwyl.

MYTHOLOGY OF ANCIENT BRITAIN AND IRELAND. By Charles Squire.

ANCIENT EGYPT. By Professor W. M. Flinders Petrie.

SCANDINAVIAN RELIGION. By W. A. Craigie.

MAGIC AND FETISHISM. By Dr. A. C. Haddon.

HINDUISM. By Dr. L. D. Barnett.

ANCIENT CHINA. By Prof. Giles.

ANCIENT GREECE. By Jane Harrison.

BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA. By Theophilus G. Pinches.

ISLAM. By Syed 'Ameer Ali, M.A.

RELIGION OF ANCIENT ROME. By Cyril Bailey, M.A.

JUDAISM. By Israel Abrahams.

SHINTO: THE ANCIENT RELIGION OF JAPAN. By W. G. Aston, C.M.G., LL.D.

IN PREPARATION

THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT ISRAEL. By Professor Jastrow.

THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT MEXICO AND PERU. By Lewis Spence.

ISLAM IN INDIA. By T. W. Arnold, Assistant Librarian at the India Office, Author of "The Preaching of Islam."

BUDDHISM. 2 vols. By Professor T. W. Rhys Davids, LL.D.

THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT PERSIA. By Dr. A. V. Williams Jackson, Professor of Iranian at Columbia University.

PRIMITIVE OR NICENE CHRISTIANITY. By John Sutherland Black, LL.D., Joint Editor of the "Encyclopædia Biblica."

MEDIÆVAL CHRISTIANITY.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION. By Dr. Leuba.

The Open Court Publishing Co.
1322 Wabash Avenue : Chicago

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

The Oldest Theological Quarterly in America

Prof. G. Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D., Editor

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Rev. Frank H. Foster, D.D., Ph.D., Olivet, Michigan.

Rev. James Lindsay, D.D., Kilmarnock, Scotland.

Rev. D. W. Simon, D.D., Bradford, England.

Rev. Hugh M. Scott, D.D., Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Charles F. Thwing, D.D., Pres. Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rev. A. A. Berle, D.D., Salem, Mass.

Rev. W. E. Barton, D.D., Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Henry A. Stimson, D.D., New York City.

Rev. William Edwards Park, D.D., Oberlin, Ohio.

¶ As heretofore the *Bibliotheca Sacra* will aim to meet the wants of the more intelligent public, both lay and clerical of all denominations, in the publication of thorough discussions of all topics of permanent interest touching the Christian religion. Prominence will continue to be given to Biblical Criticism in its various departments; Theology in its doctrinal, historical and practical aspects; and the Relation of Philosophy, Science, and Oriental Discoveries to the Bible.

¶ In addition to the continued interest of the able corps of Associate Editors, special advantages may be expected to result the coming year from the fact that Dr. Simon is to take up his permanent residence in Germany, and hence will be able to furnish fresh information from the center of intellectual movements.

¶ On account of the freedom of the Editor from the routine duties of his professorship, he will be able to give increased attention to the interests of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and adapt it still more perfectly to the deepest needs of the time. The *Quarterly* will continue its elaborate and conservative discussion of the great sociological questions that are agitating the century, but will, as heretofore, be devoted mainly to discussions by competent authorities of the profound theological and critical problems which are agitating the entire Christian public. While remaining loyal to the historic faith of Christendom, it will aim to welcome and aid all real progress in every department of human activity. On account of its long standing, and its undenominational character, the *Bibliotheca Sacra* probably has a wider circulation than any other American publication. Through it the ablest writers can at once reach every center of thought in the world. While not aiming at ephemeral popularity, in a marked degree it accomplishes the purpose of influencing the thought that in the end moves the world. Whatever periodicals of a more popular character are taken by pastors, theological students, and the more intelligent laymen, such thorough discussions as appear in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* are indispensable to a complete mastery of the great themes that are constantly coming to the surface in modern thought.

Address,

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, *Oberlin, O.*

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

ARTICLE I.

WHITTIER AS MAN, POET, AND REFORMER.¹

BY F. B. SANBORN, CONCORD, MASS.

It is no light task, in a brief space, to deal with the long and active life of one who was not only Man and Poet, and a Reformer in many directions, at the period of all others in our history abounding in the need and the diversity of reforms, political, religious, and social; but also a typical and representative New England citizen,—that character almost new in the world's long story, and destined to play so great a part in the drama of civilization on this continent. John Greenleaf Whittier bore in both his family names the evidence that his ancestors had been among the early settlers of New England; and if it be true that he was also descended from a daughter of Christopher Hussey, then he was likewise of the posterity of that sturdy old colonizer Rev. Stephen Bachiler, born four years earlier than Shakespeare, and dying, at nearly a hundred years old, in the domination of his associate in religion, Oliver Cromwell, and his son Richard. This clergyman, dispossessed of his parish in western England, at

¹ An address at the Haverhill Centenary of his Birth, Tuesday, December 17, 1907.

the suggestion of Bishop Laud, wandered for a time about England and Holland, and, after doing his part to establish a religious colony at Portland in Maine, and Yarmouth in the Pilgrim Colony, did found and partly organize the ancient town of Hampton in New Hampshire, to which his son-in-law Christopher Hussey, and his three grandsons of the Sanborn name, followed him in 1638 or soon after. The house in Hampton Falls, New Hampshire, in which Whittier died stands on a part of the large estate of Christopher Hussey, and the house occupied by that patriarch of New Hampshire was not far off. Hussey also owned land in Haverhill, although he is not supposed to have lived here for any long time. In 1653, Thomas Whittier, the poet's paternal ancestor, joined with Hussey, Edward Gove, and the three Sanborn brothers in petitioning the Boston magistracy in favor of Major Pike of Salisbury, who had spoken too freely against the Boston tyranny in suppressing Joseph Peasley, another ancestor of Whittier, who felt a call to exhort in meeting, and afterward became a Quaker. Hussey was then dwelling at Hampton Falls, and was one of the few petitioners who refused to withdraw their signatures, when bidden so to do by the Boston authorities; as Thomas Whittier, and two of my ancestors, John Sanborn and Edward Gove, also refused, and were fined for their contumacy. In the next generation most of the Husseys, Goves, and Whittiers were Quakers; for by 1675 George Fox had visited New England, the Boston and Dover Puritans had whipped and hanged Quaker women,—the graceless physicians Dr. Barefoot and Dr. Greenland, aided by Major Pike, now a high magistrate, had rescued the whipped women from the scourge of Major Waldron,—and the natural result of fervent preaching and bloody persecution had taken place. Thus was Quakerism, itself a demonstration

for radical reforms in church and state, handed down through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to our Poet, born in the first decade of the nineteenth century, and living in literary activity almost to the twentieth, for he died late in 1892.

Nor did this descendant of the martyred Quakers fail to remember their persecutions, and to visit poetic justice upon the persecutors and their successors in the business of bigotry and tyranny,—the intolerant sectarians and natural Tories of New England. The Quakers, all through the latter part of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth, had combined good citizenship and scrupulous obedience to decent laws, with a firm and demonstrative refusal to sanction negro slavery. But the so-called conservative classes—the clergy, the leading lawyers, the great merchants, and the politicians generally (with few exceptions after 1820, and until 1850)—were defenders or apologists for that blot on our Republic of Liberty. Consequently, the Man, Whittier, imbued with the ancestral spirit of opposition to legalized tyranny, and fully possessed of the democracy of religion (which Quakerism is), first drew public attention as one of the antislavery convention at Philadelphia in 1833, at the age of twenty-five. He was already known as a poet in his small circle, and indeed had then written more verses in number, and more pages of what passed for poetry, than Gray or Emerson wrote during their whole lives. But the general public hardly took note of these verses, which were eagerly read by his young contemporaries, and widely copied from the newspapers of his friends Garrison and Thayer, or from his own political newspapers, at Boston and Hartford. In these newspapers he advocated a protective tariff (as Garrison had done for a time) and the election of Henry Clay as president. His politics rather than his poetry interested the active

men of his youth; but the question of slavery, which was to supersede all others in our politics, had not, till after 1830, taken a strong hold on the people of the North. But even as his youthful verses, now forgotten, served him as exercises in poetic composition, and his journalism trained him to be, as he afterwards showed himself, a sagacious and adroit politician; so the years of his literary and ethical apprenticeship, from 1826 to 1833, slowly and almost unconsciously prepared him for the devotion of all the rest of his life to the great measures of reform, whether in his own land or elsewhere. His father, the Quaker farmer of the East Parish, was a Jeffersonian democrat, like Clay, Calhoun, and, in his own independent way, John Quincy Adams; and though the young journalist joined for a time the party of which Clay was the leader, and which soon called itself "Whig," he in fact adhered rather strictly to the Jeffersonian principles. An evidence of this is his striking poem on "Democracy," written in 1841, and making allusion to his father's political affiliations. I quote from the earlier form of these verses, which seems better than the revision which the fastidious author made many years later. It began:—

"O fairest born of love and light,
Yet bending brow and eye severe
On all that harms the holy sight,
Or wounds the pure and perfect ear!
Beautiful yet thy temples rise,
Though there profaning gifts are thrown;
And fires, unkindled of the skies,
Are glaring round thy altar-stone.

"O ideal of my boyhood's time!
The faith in which my father stood,
Even when the sons of Lust and Crime
Had stained thy peaceful courts with blood.
Beneath thy broad, impartial eye

How fade the lines of caste and birth!
How equal in their suffering lie
The groaning multitudes of earth!"

Out of these principles, from which the Quaker poet never departed, was developed, by a strange metamorphosis, the actual Democratic party of Whittier's early manhood under Jackson; against which the youthful politician soon revolted, at first under the lead of Henry Clay, himself nominally a Democrat. Garrison, too, as a beginner in politics, followed the lead of Clay; and it is a curious fact that a younger brother of the Kansas hero John Brown continued to be an active partisan of Clay, and edited a New Orleans newspaper in his interest, during the first administration of Jackson, and until his own death in 1833. Of this son Salmon Brown, his father, the old Calvinist Owen Brown, said years afterward: "Salmon was of some note as a gentleman. But I never knew that he gave evidence of being a Christian." It was otherwise with Whittier, who from the first was brought up as a Christian, though in much disregard of that form of conventional Christianity which attached importance to the office of the parish priest or minister. Nor was he, at first, very much addicted to the conventional religious literature, even of his own small sect. It was the age of Scott, Moore, and Byron, following the age of Robert Burns, who seems to have been Whittier's first favorite among poets. From none of these popular poets could he have imbibed much reverence for the titled clergy; while, from the history and traditions of his own people, he was sure to regard them as spiritual tyrants and bloody persecutors. Hence, in one of his first sallies against the Massachusetts clerisy, he recurred to the Puritan ministers who had so violently tiraded against his ancestors, the Peas-

leys and Husseys. In his scathing rebuke of the Congregational clergy in 1837 he cried, sarcastically:—

“Oh, glorious days! when Church and State
Were wedded by your spiritual fathers;
And on submissive shoulders sate
Your Wilsons and your Cotton Mathers!
No vile ‘itinerant’ then could mar
The beauty of your tranquil Zion,
But at his peril,—of the scar
Of hangman’s whip and branding iron.
Old Hampton, had her fields a tongue,—
And Salem’s streets,—could tell their story
Of fainting women dragged along,
Gashed by the whip accursed and gory.”

Whittier had learned thoroughly that dismal tale of the three Quaker women, Anna Coleman, Mary Tompkins, and Alice Ambrose, whom the old tyrant of Dover, Richard Waldron, had in 1662 ordered to be flogged at the cart’s tail from the Pascataqua River to Narragansett Bay, but who were released by the bold Major Pike of Salisbury, at the instance of Walter Barefoot, of Dover, and Henry Greenland, then of Newbury. These two doctors would have been excellent subjects for a second of those quiet novels of which “Margaret Smith’s Journal” was the first. Only their adventures would have been more boisterous than those of the gentle Margaret and her cousin Rebecca Rawson. Whittier was both poet and historian, as Scott was; and, had he not made himself quite early the poet of the Minority, he might have risen to more distinction as historical poet. As it is, he has contributed more to the ballad lore of New England than all the other poets; and this part of his work will perhaps outlast that which at first he regarded as more important,—his antislavery and reformatory verse. In the latter he seemed

to present a singular contrast between his Quaker and non-resistant principles and his belligerent words. This contrast attracted the laughing notice of Lowell, in his "Fable for Critics," who made his spokesman, Apollo, cry out:—

"'Is that,' one exclaims on beholding his knocks,
'Thy son's bloody garment, O leather-clad Fox?'
Can that be thy son, in the battle's mid din,
Preaching brotherly love,—and then driving it in
To the brain of the tough old Gollath of sin
With the smoothest of pebbles from Castaly's Spring,
Impressed on his hard moral sense with a sling?"

Whittier was pleased at this recognition of the fighter under the drab coat; and I have seen a letter of his to Lowell complimenting the almost anonymous poet on his success in the "Fable."

To be a poet of the Minority is not always to be on the right side; but the greatest poets in the world's history have held that position. If we could know all the facts about the men who wrote the epics ascribed to Homer, it would probably be true of them; and certainly it was true of Æschylus and Sophocles among the Greek dramatists; of Lucretius in Rome; Dante in Florence; Milton in England; Burns in Scotland; Wordsworth, Shelley, and Keats in England; and in our day it has been true of Browning there, and of Emerson here. This may be said, however, of the better poets of the Minority,—that if they represent, as they usually do, the higher national aspiration, the day comes, even in their lifetime, when the majority rally to their side, and they are for a while, at least, the voice of their nation. Dante never reached that fortunate day, but Milton did, and Wordsworth more slowly attained that position. So, in this country, did the poets of democracy and antislavery; and the popularity

which from the first attended the fortunate Longfellow overtook Bryant and Lowell and Whittier in the national crisis of the Civil War.

It does a poet of the right sort no harm to be mobbed a few times. Whittier was mobbed repeatedly in his early career; and twice was the serene Emerson mobbed,—at Cambridge in 1851, and at the Tremont Temple of Boston in the winter of 1860–61. In neither case was his life in danger. But when Whittier and George Thompson were mobbed, it was a question of serious bodily harm, even of death, at the hands of the furious ruffians who were impelled by those persistent American anarchists, the men of large wealth and commercial greed, who know that their riches have been immorally gained. Such were the slave-masters and their mercantile friends at the North, who sought Garrison's life in 1835, killed Lovejoy in 1837, burned the antislavery hall at Philadelphia in May, 1838, and for more than twenty years longer continued to display their sneaking form of anarchy in all the chief cities of the North. The last of this may have been the draft riots in Boston and New York in 1863; but by that time, and for a year or two before, the mob spirit turned against the defenders of slavery, and more than once compelled them to hang out the flag of their country, the Stars and Stripes; which, from the disgrace of protecting slave-auctions and floating over conquests made to extend negro slavery (as in the Mexican War), had suddenly, in 1861, become the flag of freedom once more. Through all this dismal period of national infamy, Whittier and the small band of emancipationists stood firmly for the rights of man, the cause of the poor. But I hardly think Whittier was involved in any dangerous mob after 1845; he withdrew from that physical activity in the cause which he had displayed for

a dozen years after 1832, left Haverhill for the quieter retirement of Amesbury, and did his work, either with the pen, in prose and verse, or through his rare sagacity, by advice to political associates, or those whom he wished to make such. He had undertaken to edit newspapers at Hartford, at Philadelphia, and finally at Lowell, where in 1844 he took charge of a journal devoted to political antislavery, the *Middlesex Standard*, and wrote for it not only political articles, but those brief papers, descriptive of periods or characters in New England story, which he published long ago under the title of "The Stranger in Lowell." In his capacity as editor in Lowell he became closely acquainted with the circle of young women who set going, and maintained for years, that interesting organ of literature among the factory girls,—the *Lowell Offering*. He knew Harriet Farley (who has lately died in New York at the age of ninety-two); her associate Harriot Curtis; a third Harriet, Miss Hanson, afterwards Mrs. W. S. Robinson of Concord and Malden; and Lucy Larcom, who continued to be an intimate friend so long as Whittier lived. He was therefore a well-informed witness to that cultivation of literature among the native American factory girls of New England which was so surprising a feature of our development two generations ago.

It was during Whittier's summer at your neighboring "Spindle City" of Lowell that his friend Emerson was induced by the antislavery women of Concord to place himself squarely on the emancipation side, by his address on the anniversary of West India Emancipation, given in Concord, August 1, 1844. My impression is that Whittier himself came over to report the proceedings of the day, and complained that Concord was a very mossgrown, stagnant sort of place; but that he found comfort in Emer-

son's Address, which took strong and new ground against the enslavement of a race by advantage of its virtues. It was a day long to be remembered in Concord. Hawthorne had been for two years living in the Old Manse, and was publishing those "Mosses" which preserve that ancient parsonage in immortal youth. Not sympathizing himself very much with the emancipationists, he yet made no objection to Mrs. Hawthorne's offering to have the "collation" tables spread under the trees of his avenue, which was to have been the resort of the audience after the address was over. But the summer day was lowering or rainy, and the tables were set, instead, in the county court-house, near the antique stone prison of Middlesex. To call the company together at the hour announced for the meeting, a bell must be rung; and the authorities of the two chief churches in the village, the Unitarian and Orthodox Congregational, were unwilling to have their bells rung on such an occasion. A bell was found, however, which did not refuse to ring when Henry Thoreau pulled the rope; and thus the faithful were summoned to the first of Emerson's strictly political addresses. I owe a knowledge of these facts to a lively letter by Miss Anne Whiting in the *Herald of Freedom*, at Concord, New Hampshire, a weekly edited by Thoreau and Whittier's friend Nathaniel P. Rogers. No considerable part of the address appeared in Whittier's Lowell newspaper, the orator reserving it for a pamphlet edition, which he soon issued. It was not long after this, and while Whittier had charge of the Lowell newspaper, that he offered to the poet Longfellow to have him nominated for Congress in the Middlesex District, on the Liberty Party ticket. A vacancy existed in this district, which then included Cambridge, Concord, and Lowell, because neither the Democratic nor the Whig party had been

able to elect their candidate, on account of the considerable antislavery vote in the county. Whittier had seen that the few antislavery poems of Longfellow, reprinted as a tract at the North, had been very well received, and he said to Longfellow that they "had been of important service to the Liberty movement." He therefore urged on his brother-poet the acceptance of a congressional nomination, saying, "Our friends think they could throw for thee one thousand more votes than for any other man." Dating his reply, September, 1844, Longfellow answered:—

"It is impossible for me to accept the Congressional nomination you propose, because I do not feel myself qualified for the duties of such an office, and because I do not belong to the Liberty Party. Though a strong anti-slavery man, I am not a member of any society, and fight under no single banner. At all times I shall rejoice in the progress of true liberty, and in freedom from slavery of all kinds; but I cannot for a moment think of entering the political arena. Partisan warfare becomes too violent, too vindictive for my taste."

This was not meant as a reproof to Whittier, but it indicated what was then a common view among educated men. Sumner himself was then averse to politics, like his intimate friend Longfellow, and "could not for a moment think of entering the political arena." He also declined a congressional nomination, two years later, against Robert C. Winthrop, and allowed his intimate friend Dr. Howe to lose credit and influence by standing for Congress in his place. A few years later Sumner was forced to become a politician, upon his election to the Senate. Indeed, Longfellow's brother-professor in Harvard College Dr. Palfrey was nominated and chosen to Congress from this same Middlesex District; and it was in support of his reelection that Emerson made the speech in 1851 which procured for him a storm of hisses at the Cambridge public meeting. Whittier never had scruples of this

scholarly kind against engaging in politics. In early years of activity he had desired a nomination to Congress; he had been chosen to the State Legislature, had served there, and was ready at all times to take his part, with his fellow-citizens, in the duties and discomforts of self-government. Nothing was farther from his thoughts than anarchy; he was one of the multitude himself, and depended on seeing the function of government duly performed in his province, whatever that province might be. If he thought ill of his country's Constitution, he knew how it could be improved, and he set to work to make things better. He was never a believer in the non-voting hypothesis of government, and he separated from Garrison and the extreme abolitionists on that issue, among others. Like most of the Quakers, however, he did not believe in war; and made the mistake of supposing, as late as 1859, that slavery could be peacefully abolished.

Things had got beyond that even in 1847, when Whittier became one of the chief editorial writers for Dr. Bailey's *National Era*, the antislavery weekly established in Washington, after the cause of Liberty began to have bold defenders in the House and Senate at the national capital. One of the first of these, in point of time, was the aged Ex-president John Quincy Adams, whose great political prudence had kept him from acting against slavery while president, and candidate for the presidency; but who, as early as 1820, had seen, with his native sagacity, that slavery and the Union could not continue long to coexist, and had entered in his Diary for February 24, in that year, this remarkable passage:—

“I had some conversation with Calhoun on the slave-question pending in Congress. He said he did not think it would produce a dissolution of the Union; but if it should, the South would be compelled to

form an alliance, offensive and defensive, with Great Britain. I said, that would be returning to the Colonial state. He said 'Yes, pretty much; but it would be forced upon them.' I pressed the conversation no further.

"But if the dissolution of the Union should result from the slave-question, it is as obvious as anything that can be foreseen of the future, that it must shortly afterwards be followed by the universal emancipation of the slaves. Slavery is the great and foul stain upon the North American Union, and it is a contemplation worthy of the most exalted soul, whether its total abolition is or is not practicable; if practicable, by what means it may be effected, and if a choice of means be within scope, what means would accomplish it at the smallest-cost of human suffering?"

Having thus stated the problem Mr. Adams went on to foretell its solution, in these extraordinary words, which our age has seen literally fulfilled, forty-odd years after they were inscribed in the secret diary of a secretary of state at Washington:—

"A dissolution, at least temporary, of the Union as now constituted, would be necessary; and the dissolution must be upon a point involving the question of slavery and no other. The Union might then be reorganized on the fundamental principle of Emancipation. This object is vast in its compass, awful in its prospects,—sublime and beautiful in its issue. A life devoted to it would be nobly spent,—or sacrificed."

Many lives were, in effect, so sacrificed, but not Adams's own. He continued to uphold the Union as it was,—the Union fatally tied to the perishable barbarism of slavery, and certain, if the tie were not cut, to destroy both the country and its barbarism. Whittier for many years, after opposing slavery with all his might, still cherished the delusion that it could be peacefully abolished. Once it could have been, had Washington and Jefferson, in the closing decade of the eighteenth century, followed the lead of Franklin, wisest man of his century, who pressed actively for emancipation, as did the real leaders of the French Revolution, and the English

liberals. Both those great Virginians knew that Franklin was right; both were abolitionists; and Jefferson, who succeeded Franklin at the disorganized Court of the French monarchy, printed at Paris, in 1785, those words of truthful description which have been so often quoted:—

“The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism, on the one part,—and degrading submissions on the other. . . . With what execration should that statesman be loaded who, permitting one-half the citizens to trample on the rights of the other half, transforms those into despots and these into enemies,—destroying the morals of the one part and the patriotism of the other! And can the liberties of a nation be deemed secure when we have removed their only firm basis,—a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God,—that they are not to be violated without His wrath? I tremble for Virginia when I reflect that God is just; that His justice cannot sleep forever; that, considering numbers, Nature, and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of Fortune is among possible events; that it may become probable by supernatural interference. The Almighty has no attribute that can take sides with us in such a contest.”

Why, then, did not Washington and Jefferson, with their high-toned neighbor Colonel George Mason, act upon the considerations so forcibly stated? Because, I fancy, the political problems of their time were so pressing that they felt it a duty to hold the nation together, against the soured enmity of England, long coveting her revolted Colonies, and the wild ambition of Napoleon, which fluctuated between establishing an American empire based on negro slavery, and giving up the French possessions in America to strengthen our Republic against England, which was his real motive in selling Louisiana to Jefferson. And our nation was held together, in spite of the angry disunion sentiment of the New England Federalists in 1804, ready to join with Aaron Burr in overthrowing the “Virginia dynasty,”—and against the tendency to separation on the part of the Mississippi Valley States, a

few years later; when Burr hoped, by their aid, to establish for himself a vast slaveholding empire in Louisiana, Texas, and Mexico. Thwarted in this by the sagacity of Jefferson and the honesty of Andrew Jackson, Burr betook himself to Europe, and there for years sought to betray his country either to England or to Napoleon, as either should offer him the highest personal bribe. I have seen a letter from Washington by a New Hampshire member of Congress, John Adams Harper, in 1813, to his party leader, the Democratic Governor of New Hampshire, William Plumer, in which he reported an offer made by Napoleon, then beginning to be in straits after his failure in Russia, that he would join with England in dividing the troublesome American States at the Potomac,—Great Britain to take New England and the Northern half; and France, Virginia, Louisiana, and the Southern half. This offer, if ever made, may have been only one of those schemes chasing each other through the restless mind of the French despot; but it would not have been unacceptable to some of the New England Federalists, who were quite ready, from 1812 to the victory of Jackson at New Orleans, to welcome an alliance with England, if not absolute dependence on the still reigning George III.

However this may be, the necessity of holding our young Republic together forbade efforts to abolish slavery by peaceful compensation; and by 1830 it had so strengthened itself, with the aid of King Cotton, that the South became insolent, and refused even to consider its abolition. From that time forward, its destruction by force was the only solution of the problem, unless the North should be willing to see slavery made national, instead of decreasingly sectional. For this bad purpose the annexation of Texas was carried; and the Mexican War was waged; and after 1848 the question, as a

practical one, was no longer emancipation, but how to stop slavery extension and the reopening of the slave-trade. Upon that basis the Liberty party, of which Whittier was one of the chief founders, was merged in the Free-soil party of 1848, supporting Van Buren for the presidency against the Southern Whig General Taylor, and soon carrying Massachusetts by an alliance with the Jeffersonian democrats, headed by Boutwell and Rantoul. The disgust of Massachusetts at Webster's Fugitive-slave Law, and his seventh of March speech, in 1850, gave the election of that November into the hands of the coalition, and Whittier was then called upon to use his matchless powers of political combination and persuasion, to secure the election to the Senate of his friend Charles Sumner. It was he who induced Sumner to be the candidate of the coalition, in the early winter of 1850-51; and, although at one point he advised Sumner to withdraw, in order to rebuke the bad faith of certain Democrats,—among them his old friend Caleb Cushing,—yet the candidate stayed in the field, and was elected, late in April, by a single vote. This was the beginning of Sumner's great service to his native State, which continued till his death in 1874,—the most faithful servant and wisest statesman Massachusetts has had for a century. When he was maliciously censured by a partisan legislature, for one of the best acts of his life, Whittier was unwearied in getting the stigma removed.

By this time the poet of the Minority had become the aged seer and adviser of the Majority; and well did Whittier perform this later duty. Good sense is not reckoned among the most conspicuous and expected qualities of poets; but it was characteristic of our Merrimac Valley poet from the first. Had his health after childhood been as robust and cheerful as his common sense, he would have been a noted leader in

the most active paths of politics and reforms. But an early injury, growing out of his excessive farm-labors, kept him on the borders of invalidism all the rest of his days, and made him much more retired in his way of life than his natural tendency would have suggested. He had the good Yankee quality of "sociability"; he was neighborly and even gossiping in his nature, and spent many hours in his village existence, sitting on stools and boxes in groceries and shoe-shops, chatting with his townsmen. He did not put the company to flight, and check conversation, when he set foot in the familiar group seated around the stove, as Emerson complains that he did. Nor was there ever a poet who better understood the conditions and sentiments of labor in New England; and his "Songs of Labor," in their merits and defects, went very close to the mark. He had been a laborer himself, and from first to last he sympathized with the upright industry and thrift of New England.

His familiarity with all that went to compose the idyll of rural life in New England,—the toil, the prayer, the nooning of Summer, the snow-bound days of Winter, the grace of Spring, the painted pageant of October,—the domestic life of women, the fun and earnest of the village,—the days of haymaking on the Salisbury and Hampton meadows, the freighting of hay on the Merrimac,—all this and more constitutes Whittier the laureate of ancient Essex and Rockingham, the two counties with which his early life made him best acquainted. Few of us now survive who remember, of our own observation, all that he relates; but there it is, packed away, like honey in the hive, in the fascinating story of "Snow-Bound." It sounds a little strained to apply the word "great" to any one of Whittier's poems; but this one comes so near being a great poem, that the author's modesty

must allow the designation. The characters in "Snow-Bound" stand out clear and fresh, like the persons in Homer; or, more exactly, they recall the rustic scenes and personages of Hesiod. This field of poesy—what has been called both pastoral and idyllic—belongs to Whittier by natural right, as much as his hexameters to Hesiod, or the Doric and Sicilian strains of Theocritus or Moschus. Affectation is lacking; the picture is drawn, the person is presented, with all the offhand readiness of Nature herself. Only those who have forgotten the homely dialect of Rockingham and Essex will catch at some of Whittier's words as odd. They come naturally from him; and so do the colloquial misfits of accent and rhyme, that sometimes make the scholar smile. Whittier could accent "rómance" and "ídeal" on their first syllable, and we let it pass; as in that favorite poem of his own "The Reformer," which to me, also, has ever seemed one of his best, both in thought and melody:—

"Young Romance raised his dreamy eyes
O'erhung with paly locks of gold,—
'Why smite,' he asked, in sad surprise,
'The fair, the old?'"

The picture is a good one; indeed, this poem is a series of pictures, in verse wellnigh faultless:—

"All grim and solled, and brown with tan,
I saw a Strong One, in his wrath,
Smiting the godless shrines of man
Along his path.

"The Church, beneath her trembling dome,
Essayed in vain her ghostly charm:
Wealth shook within his gilded home,
With strange alarm.

"Fraud from his secret chambers fled
Before the sunlight bursting in:
Sloth drew her pillow o'er her head
To drown the din.

"'Spare,' Art implored, 'yon holy pile!
 'That grand, old, time-worn turret spare!'
 Meek Reverence, kneeling in the aisle,
 Cried out 'Forbear!'

"Gray-bearded Use, who, deaf and blind,
 Groped for his old accustomed stone,
 Leaned on his staff, and wept to find
 His seat o'erthrown."

All this shocks the poet; but after a pause he looks again:—

"The grain grew green on battle-plains,
 O'er swarded war-mounds grazed the cow;
 The slave stood forging from his chains
 The spade and plow.

.

"Through prison walls, like Heaven-sent hope,
 Fresh breezes blew, and sunbeams strayed;
 And with the idle gallows-rope
 The young child played.

.

"The outworn rite, the old abuse,
 The plous fraud transparent grown,
 The Good held captive in the use
 Of Wrong alone,—

"These wait their doom,—from that great law
 Which makes the past time serve To-day:
 And fresher life the world shall draw
 From their decay.

"O backward-looking son of Time!
 The new is old, the old is new;
 The cycle of a change sublime
 Still sweeping through."

Here is the optimism, and something of the mysticism, of Emerson and Thoreau; and this poem dates from 1846, when the summer of Transcendentalism was not yet waning into autumn. But this optimism was sometimes amiss in its confident prediction; as in that mistaken ballad of Whittier on "Brown of Osawatomie," which, late in 1859, hardly fifteen months before the outbreak of the Civil War, and while the

murders in Kansas were scarcely ended, declared that the day of battle was over :—

“Nevermore may yon Blue Ridges the Northern rifle
hear
Nor see the light of blazing homes flash on the
negro’s spear!
But let the free-winged angel Truth their guarded
passes scale,
To teach that Right is more than Might, and Justice
more than mail.

“So vainly shall Virginia set her battle in array;
In vain her trampling squadrons knead the winter
snow with clay.
She may strike the pouncing eagle, but she dares not
harm the dove;
And every gate she bars to Hate shall open wide to
Love!”

Whittier’s mistake here was twofold; he assumed, contrary to the fact, that John Brown was inspired by hatred of the slaveholders; and he exaggerated the power of Christian love in dealing with men in a passion. The Virginians of 1859 were no longer capable of considering calmly the emancipation of their slaves, as they might have done while Washington and George Mason were living; they misinterpreted every effort to free the land from its worst clog and contradiction, negro slavery. As for Brown, his hatred of the barbarism of slavery was complete; but he regarded all men with a broad charity, and preferred to believe them good men until their actions showed the contrary. Unlike as he was in externals to Coventry Patmore’s gentle heroine, it could be said of him as of her :—

“His life, all honor, observed with awe,
Which cross experience could not mar,
The fiction of the Christian law,
That all men honorable are.”

This also was Whittier's turn of mind, after he had outgrown the vehemence of his early onslaughts against classes and persons; it is, indeed, the principle of the higher Quakerism.

Brown was wiser than Whittier, when he said on the last day of his Virginia prison-cell, "I am now quite certain that the crimes of this guilty land will never be purged away but with blood. I had, as I now think, vainly, flattered myself that without very much bloodshed it might be done." Six years had to pass, and the winter snow be five times trampled with the red clay of Virginia, before either Love or Hate could open the door to Richmond. Even then another martyr must be added to Brown, and the myriads who followed him in death; and Abraham Lincoln must die by an assassin, ere the cause for which Brown and Lincoln died could peacefully prevail. The bullet as well as the ballot was needful to destroy Slavery; and that our poet lived to see. Then, in fact, after years of battle,—

"Where frowned the fort, pavilions gay,
And cottage windows, flower-entwined,
Looked out upon the peaceful bay
And hills behind,"

and the aged bard could sing, as he had chanted forty years earlier,—

"Grown wiser for the lesson given,
I fear no longer; for I know
That where the share is deepest driven,
The best fruits grow."

ARTICLE II.

"SUFFER LITTLE CHILDREN, AND FORBID THEM
NOT, TO COME UNTO ME."

AN EXPOSITION OF MATTHEW XIX. 13-15.

BY HUGH K. WAGNER, ESQ., ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.

"It must not be dissembled that there are many real difficulties in the Christian Scriptures; whilst, at the same time, more, I believe, and greater, may justly be imputed to certain maxims of interpretation, which have obtained authority without reason, and are received without inquiry."—PALEY (from a sermon on 2 Peter iii. 15-16).

WITH a profound conviction that, notwithstanding the lavish use which has been made of this passage of Scripture, in theological controversy and otherwise, the Word of God can yet shed light upon it, we undertake the gathering together of the rays of that light, in order that, when brought to a proper focus, they may illuminate this text with the mind of the Spirit of God, and dispel the mists and darkness of vagueness and preconceived opinion which have heretofore clouded its interpretation. We may run the risk of being thought presumptuous, but will, nevertheless, venture the assertion that no other passage of Scripture, considering the immense frequency with which it has been cited from the fathers to the present time, has received such cursory and arbitrary treatment as has this one.

The fact that it was so early in the church's history taken as a ground for the baptism of infants, seems to have influenced all subsequent exegesis. "*Ait Dominus, Nolite illos prohibere venire ad me,*" was the common expression of

satisfaction with the practice of infant baptism for centuries.¹ That custom prevailing for many centuries, and being universal, after the time of Irenæus, until the Reformation brought in the spirit of inquiry concerning the things of God, the passage seems to have acquired a supposititious meaning, one which sanctioned the baptism of infants, although baptism is not at all mentioned in either it or the parallel passages in the other Gospels, whilst the most ardent advocate of infant baptism would hardly contend that the little children here particularly referred to were brought to Jesus to be baptized; for John iv. 2 expressly tells us that "Jesus himself baptized not." The fact that "but his disciples" is added does not change the situation at all; for we read, also, "but the disciples rebuked them" (Matt. xix. 13).

We do not, however, wish it to be thought that we purpose writing upon the subject of baptism—a fruitful cause of strife and contention. We confine ourselves to the elucidation of a single incident in the life of our blessed Lord, and believe that our labor is not in vain. Our introductory references to baptism merely serve to indicate the probable cause of the obscurity of exegesis accorded this not unimportant passage of Scripture.

The passage itself is as follows:—

"Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them and pray; and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hands on them and departed thence."

We have here seven facts stated, and we believe that each one will be found to contribute its quota to the establishment of our general proposition.

The *first* fact stated is that, "Then were there brought unto

¹ Apost. Const. vi. 15, p. 380.

him little children"; the *second*, "that he should put his hands on them"; the *third*, "and pray"; the *fourth*, "and the disciples rebuked them" ("that brought them," adds Mark; but these words are omitted by the two oldest manuscripts and the Revised Version, although this does not alter the meaning at all); the *fifth*, "But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven"; the *sixth*, "And he laid his hands on them"; the *seventh*, "and departed thence."

Each of the three synoptic Gospels gives us an account of this matter, the parallel narratives being Mark x. 13-16 and Luke xviii. 15-17. Mark says:—

"And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them; and his disciples rebuked those [that brought them]. But, when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily, I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them."

The only change worthy of note at this point which Luke's narrative gives us is that the "little children" who were brought to him are called "infants," in supposed correspondence to a difference in the Greek word used, which the Revised Version renders "babes." We shall reserve our comments on this variation for another place; and merely remark now that it is not well to lay undue stress on this difference in the accounts, for reasons which will later appear.

As an additional preliminary, in order that all the facts may be fairly before us, it is proper to call attention to the slight changes of rendering of the Revised Version. Those worthy of notice are, in addition to the one noted *supra*, the insertion of the definite article before "little children" in

each case where the phrase "suffer little children" occurs, like the A.V. of Mark x. 14; the change, in Matt. xix. 13, from "put his hands on them" to "lay his hands on them"; and the change, in Mark x. 16, from, "And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them," to, "And he took them in his arms, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them."

For convenience, we will here divide our subject into two heads: (1) the literal meaning of this passage, and (2) the spiritual teaching. The general haziness concerning the spiritual sense of this portion of Scripture is, to a considerable degree, attributable to the inaccurate appreciation of the nature of the historical facts related, we believe.

I.

We shall first endeavor to show the real nature of this incident in the life of our Lord. We believe that we have here, briefly described, one of our Lord's miracles of healing. Whatever blessing Jesus conveyed to the little children was in the fact that he cured physical disease with which they were suffering. Not all of the miracles worked by our blessed Lord whilst on earth are recorded in Scripture (John xxi. 25); and many of those recorded are given no special mention, details being omitted. The present instance is one of those miracles of healing where the details are omitted. Merely for example, and to show how numerous his works of healing undoubtedly were, and also to show the brevity of the account of some of them, we here quote Luke iv. 40: "Now, when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them." To the same effect is Matt. xii. 15, which says: "And great multitudes

followed him, and he healed them all"; and Matt. xix. 2 contains a like statement, there being a difference of only a word or two from the passage last quoted, although the events recorded are not the same, but are separate instances of the fact we are showing.

In view of the fact that multitudes were cured by our Lord, as in the three instances cited, and no detailed account thereof preserved by the inspired penmen, there is not *a priori* improbability in the view here advocated—i. e., that a miracle of healing is briefly and *sketchily* narrated in the passage we are considering. A sufficient reason for suppressing the details of the miracle, and pressing on to teach the lesson which, as we learn from the accounts in Mark and Luke, our Saviour drew from the incident (that of humility), is found in the fact that enough miracles are related in detail, whilst the moral lessons, both before and after this event, are plainer to our minds because not interrupted by a diversion stating the details of this miracle. This being the purpose of the narrative, it is not surprising that the miracle should be referred to rather by implication than expressly. This, however, is still only hypothesis, and must be proved. That we shall now undertake to do.

In the fact that the little children were brought unto him "that he should put his hands on them" ("lay his hands on them," R.V.), we get the first hint that a miracle was sought, and that those who brought the children desired that they might be healed. We deduce this from the fact that it was our Lord's custom, in all his miracles of healing, to lay his hands on the recipient of the blessing of health. This is shown by a passage already cited in another connection (Luke iv. 40). We there read that a large number of sick with divers diseases were brought unto him "when the sun

was setting" (late in the day), "and he laid his hands on every one of them." If it had not been his invariable custom to lay his hands on the sick when healing them, he would certainly have omitted it here where there were so many to be healed, and at such a late hour, and after the day's toil; but "He laid his hands *on every one of them.*" We may, in fact, readily infer that the laying on of our Lord's hands quickly became associated, in the mind of the people, with the thought of healing, so that, with the people, to speak of the one was to imply the other, as in our text.

In the New Testament, there are five classes of references to the laying on of hands:—

a. Meaning personal violence; as, when we read that the ungenerous servant "laid hands on him, and took him by the throat, saying, Pay me that thou owest" (Matt. xviii. 28); or, when it is said: "Then came they and laid hands on Jesus, and took him (Matt. xxvi. 50). Herod, likewise, "laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison" (Matt. xiv. 3). The other occurrences of this phrase, in this sense, in the New Testament, are: Matt. xxi. 46; Mark xiv. 46; Luke xx. 19; xxi. 12; John vii. 30, 44; viii. 20; Acts iv. 3; v. 18; xxi. 27.

b. With relation to the separation to some special work; as, Acts vi. 6; xiii. 3.

c. The casual reference to the Old Testament doctrine of the laying on of hands (Heb. vi. 2).

d. In connection with the impartation of the Holy Ghost and spiritual gifts; as, Acts viii. 17-19; xix. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14; v. 22; 2 Tim. i. 6.

e. For the purpose of healing. In this latter sense, it occurs more frequently than in all the others combined, while it is manifest that the first three of the above-named uses have

absolutely no bearing on our present subject. The fourth use can have no relation to our subject for several reasons, of which it will probably be sufficient now to specify one, to wit, "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; *for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified*" (John vii. 39). The instances in which laying or putting on of hands (sometimes called "touching") for the purpose of curing the sick or raising the dead is mentioned in the New Testament are the following: Matt. viii. 3, 15; ix. 18, 25, 29; xx. 34; Mark i. 31, 41; v. 23, 41-42; vi. 5 (see ver. 2); vii. 32-33; viii. 22-25; ix. 27; xvi. 18; Luke iv. 40; v. 13; viii. 54; xiii. 13; xxii. 51; John ix. 6, 11, 15; Acts v. 12; ix. 17; xiv. 3; xix. 11; xxviii. 8.

A survey of these passages will show that, in the four Gospels, there are but two kinds of references to the laying on of hands, i. e., those above designated *a* and *e*. The references to violence by the expression "laid hands on him" being easily understood as having no possible bearing on our subject, we are able to affirm that, in every relevant instance in the Gospels where laying on of hands is mentioned, it is in connection with a work of healing.

From all this, it is evident that, when they brought little children unto him, "that he should put his hands on them" ("lay his hands on them," R.V.), the thought that the children were in some way sick, and that they sought a cure at his hands, is plainly implied, due to the intimate connection between his cures and the touch or laying on of his hands. But, not to stop at this, we have clear accounts of three other instances where the sick or dead were expressly called to his attention, "that he should lay his hands on them," where the object of the laying on of his hands cannot be questioned,

and which serve to establish our proposition that, in bringing the sick to him for help, they were in the habit of doing it "that he should lay his hands on them," well knowing that blessing and recovery immediately followed the imposition of his hands. The three instances just referred to are recorded in Mark v. 23; vii. 32; viii. 22. In Mark v. 22-23, we read that Jairus came to him, "and besought him greatly, saying, My little daughter lieth at the point of death; I pray thee, *come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be healed, and she shall live.*" Mark vii. 32-33 says: "And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech; *and they beseech him to put his hand upon him.* And he took him aside from the multitude, and put his fingers into his ears, and he spit and touched his tongue." Mark viii. 22-25, which gives us the third instance, besides the one in the passage the subject of this exposition, where the people brought the afflicted that he might touch them, instead of saying "that he might cure them," tells us that he came to Bethsaida; "and they bring a blind man unto him, and *besought him to touch him.* And he took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the town; and, when he had spit on his eyes, *and put his hands on him,* he asked him if he saw aught. And he looked up, and said, I see men as trees, walking. After that, he *put his hands again upon his eyes,* and made him look up; and he was restored, and saw every man clearly."

Enough Scriptures have been cited to show reason for the people's associating Christ's works of healing with the laying on of his hands; also, to show that they asked him to lay his hands on them as a synonymous expression with asking to be healed (Mark v. 23), made clean (Matt. viii. 2; Mark i. 40; Luke v. 12), or made whole (Mark v. 28). Jesus himself

spoke of forgiveness of sins as synonymous with healing, and asked, "Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, Arise, take up thy bed, and walk?" (Mark ii. 9; Matt. ix. 5). In view of the works wrought by the hands of Jesus, the association of their thoughts of healing by him with the imposition of his hands is not surprising; but it appears, furthermore, that the ancient prophets of God, with the accounts of whose lives the people were more or less familiar, had some similar form which they used in working miracles; for "Naaman was wroth, and went away, and said, Behold, I thought he will surely come out to me, and stand, and call on the name of the Lord, his God, *and strike his hand over the place*, and recover the leper" (2 Kings v. 11).

In addition to the touching with the hand by the prophets, a "calling on the name of the Lord, their God," seems, also, to have been part of their usual procedure in working miracles, as we see above and in the following passages of Scripture: Ex. viii. 12, 30; xv. 25; 1 Kings xvii. 20; xviii. 30-37; 2 Kings iv. 33; vi. 17-18; xx. 11.

In like manner, the apostles, when working miracles of healing, both prayed and laid their hands on the sick person, as in the case of the father of Publius; "to whom Paul entered in, and prayed, and laid his hands on him and healed him" (Acts xxviii. 8), and in the case of Tabitha, or Dorcas, who was raised from the dead in response to the prayer of Peter (Acts ix. 40). See, also, Mark xvi. 18; Jas. v. 14-15; 1 John v. 16.

Prayer was not omitted even by Christ, and, from what the Scriptures expressly state on the subject, we can readily infer that our Lord prayed unto the Father in connection with each of his miracles—because of the people which stood by, that

they might believe that the Father had sent him (John xi. 42). At the grave of Lazarus, we have recorded probably the longest address to the Father in connection with a miracle, it being stated as follows: "And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou *hast heard me*. And I knew that thou hearest me *always*, but because of the people which stand by *I said it*, that they may believe that thou hast sent me" (John xi. 41-42). Strictly speaking, this is not the prayer itself, no request being herein contained, and being thanksgiving rather than prayer, the italicized words showing that his prayer had already been offered up. But it is just as pertinent as a proof of his practice of praying in connection with his miracles as if it were the prayer itself, because it refers to the prayer. Our Lord's custom in this respect is shown not only by his words, "I knew that thou hearest me *always*," coming in such a connection, nor alone by Martha's evident reference to his custom at the working of miracles, when she, entreating him to raise up her brother from the dead, says: "But I know that, even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee" (John xi. 22). It is shown, also, by a number of other actual instances where he prayed in connection with his works of healing. The other passages where our Lord's prayers in connection with his miracles are recorded are: Matt. xiv. 19; Mark vi. 41; vii. 34; Luke ix. 16; John ix. 31. Each one of these passages relates to one of our Lord's miracles; and, in each (except John ix. 31, of which we shall presently treat separately), do we read that Jesus "lifted up his eyes to heaven." That this indicates the act of prayer cannot be doubted, since we are told, as above quoted, of his lifting up his eyes to heaven in connection with his prayer at the grave of Lazarus. In addition, we read, at the beginning of his beautiful prayer in

the seventeenth of John, that "These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son, also, may glorify thee," etc. The Pharisee *stood* and prayed, undoubtedly with his eyes upturned to heaven, whilst the publican, by way of contrast, "would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven" (Luke xviii. 13).

It may seem almost a work of supererogation to prove that the passages above cited, in which Jesus is said to have lifted up his eyes to heaven in connection with his miracles, indicate his attitude of prayer in those cases; but we have done so because we wish to assume nothing in this exposition, and to "prove all things" (1 Thess. v. 21). We have not exhausted the proofs from Scripture on this point, but will not cite more, deeming the foregoing sufficient.

The remaining instance of Jesus' praying in connection with a miracle is related in John ix. 31, which says: "Now, we know that God *heareth not* sinners; but, if any man be a worshiper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth."

This was the comment of the man born blind upon the miracle of having his sight given him. He shows that Jesus worked this miracle by the power of God by referring to a point of Old Testament teaching with which all those who weekly heard those Scriptures read in the synagogue were familiar, i. e., that God *heareth not sinners* (in prayer). "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me," says the Psalmist (Ps. lxvi. 18). Now, "this man" (ver. 33) had been heard of God, as evidenced by the miracle, and was, therefore, not a sinner, reasons this erstwhile blind man. That he had been heard of God, manifestly indicates that he had prayed to the Father for the sight of this blind man, and it is clear, too, that he had done so in the presence and hearing

of the man himself; for he argues, from the fact that that prayer had been heard and answered, that the One who had thus been heard was not a sinner, because "we know," said he, "that God heareth not sinners."

The custom of Jesus being to pray before each miracle, for the reason he himself gives in John xi. 42, *supra*, as established by the passages of Scripture we have cited, another link is added to the chain of proof that, when there "were brought unto him little children that he should put his hands on them *and pray*," those children were brought to him, not for some vague, mystical, perchance magical, and intangible spiritual influence, of an unknown nature, but for the definite and tangible purpose of being healed of disease, according to his usual form of laying on of hands and prayer.

We now come to a third point: "And he laid his hands on them, *and departed thence*" (ver. 15).

Immediately after performing the miracle and teaching the brief lesson of humility recorded by Mark and Luke in that connection, the crowds gathering, he "departed thence." This, too, was in accordance with his custom. After many of his miracles, he withdrew himself from the people, he was hidden from their view, or he departed thence. Under this head, for example, we will quote the following: "And he that was healed wist not who it was; *for Jesus had conveyed himself away, a multitude being in that place*" (John v. 13). Here we have stated not only the fact that multitudes gathered after his miracles (a thing obviously to be expected), but that his reason for withdrawing himself after his miracles was to avoid the crowds. He might merely have desired to be alone (Mark vii. 24); but his reason for avoiding the people after his miracles plainly was that they desired to make him their king, which was not in accordance with God's purpose

or Christ's mission at that time. Thus, after the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand (John vi.), we read: "Then those men, when they had seen the miracle which Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world. When Jesus, therefore, perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone" (John vi. 14-15). More needs not to be said on this point, and it only remains to refer to the record of instances where Jesus "departed thence" after certain of his miracles, which instances are recorded as follows: Matt. ix. 7, 27; xii. 15; xv. 29; Mark i. 35; vi. 1; ix. 30; Luke v. 16; John v. 13; vi. 15. Besides this, there are numbers of passages telling of injunctions to secrecy, for the same reason, concerning our Lord's miracles, "charging them straitly that no man should know it," which are as follows: Matt. viii. 4; ix. 30; xii. 16; Mark i. 43-44; v. 43; vii. 36; viii. 26; ix. 9; Luke v. 14; viii. 56.

We now turn to the *possible* objections to this view, which are but two in number: (1) That it is said (Matt. xix. 13; Mark x. 18; Luke xviii. 15) "but the disciples rebuked them," it seeming improbable, it may be said, that the disciples would rebuke those that brought their children unto Christ, if they were afflicted with disease and sought a cure; (2) that Mark adds to the narrative of the other evangelists the additional detail that "he blessed them" (Mark x. 16).

We freely grant that the first of these objections is a fair one and should be fairly met. At first sight, it would seem well-nigh incredible that any one could ever have objected to children afflicted by disease being brought to the Great Physician for healing. We believe, however, that we have something more to offer than the mere asseveration that that

is the fact. The forwardness of the disciples in administering their rebukes is well illustrated by Peter's Satan-inspired rebuke to our ever-blessed Lord (Matt. xvi. 22; Mark viii. 32-33). But the depths of the meanness of the human heart are as unknowable as its deceitfulness and wickedness (Jer. xvii. 9), and approach in unsearchableness to the judgments and ways of God, which are past finding out (Rom. xi. 33). Under these circumstances, the citation of other and like examples of interference with those who sought Christ for healing is all that can fairly be demanded of us, in reply to this objection. These examples we produce forthwith: Matt. xx. 31; Mark x. 48; Luke xviii. 39; Mark ix. 38-39; Luke ix. 49-50; Matt. xv. 22-23; see, also, 2 Kings iv. 27.

In the first instance cited, "two blind men, sitting by the wayside, when they heard that Jesus passed by, cried out, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou Son of David. *And the multitude rebuked them*, because they should hold their peace."

In the second instance referred to above, the disciples saw one casting out devils in the name of Jesus; and, because he followed not the disciples, they forbade him. O human perversity! O sectarianism personified! He followed not after them, and, therefore, they forbade him to work miracles for the alleviation of suffering humanity. Consider the condition of the man who had his dwelling in the tombs (Mark v. 1-16), and judge whether or not any disease could be half so dreadful as demon possession, and whether or not the men who could forbid the casting out of devils (for the reason given by them) were not equally capable of rebuking those who brought little children to their Master to be healed, interrupting, as the disciples thought, his preceding discourse with the Pharisees.

In the third instance given, however, the reason advanced by the disciples probably reaches the lowest plane, being simple selfishness, of the grossest type. "And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil. But he answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying, *Send her away, for she crieth after us.*"

Another instance of the same nature is that of Gehazi (2 Kings iv. 27), "who came near to thrust away" the Shunammite woman from Elisha's feet, when she had come to him to beg that the life of her son might be restored.

With all this before us, it is believed that it is no longer incredible that the disciples were quite capable of rebuking those that brought little children unto Christ for healing, when, according to their notions, their pragmatical interference was necessary to save the Lord from interruption in his conversation with the Pharisees who came to tempt him, the little children being brought to him "then" (*tote*—"at that time"), according to Matt. xix. 13, i. e., immediately after Jesus had spoken the words recorded in Matt. xix. 12 to the Pharisees.

The second objection has intrinsically little in it, and would not merit notice, were it not that the common view makes so much of it. It is alleged that there was a custom among the Jews, at that period, of bringing children to their famous teachers or rabbins, or any eminent person, in order that such dignitary might pronounce a benediction or blessing upon them, and that, in so doing, the words of blessing were accompanied by the imposition of hands on the child's head, "by this rite" (in the present instance), says Lightfoot, "to admit them into the number of his disciples, or to own them

as belonging to his kingdom." Of course, this is a mere *dictum* on the part of Lightfoot. With a unanimity which would be beautiful, were its foundation scriptural, Lightfoot, Calmet, Clarke, Scott, Porteus, Edwards, Newman, Jacobus, Andrews, Farrar, Geikie, Ewald, Strauss, Keim, and others too numerous to name, from the most diverse, and even opposite, schools of Christian and unchristian doctrine, all *assume* the existence of such a custom at that time. With almost equal unanimity, these commentators seem to have thought it superfluous to *prove* its existence, whilst Whitby argues against the existence of such custom, saying that, if such custom had then obtained, the disciples would have known it, and would not have rebuked them. Geikie, it is true, gives us an irrelevant quotation from the Talmud¹ in an endeavor, which few seem to have thought it necessary to make, to substantiate his assertion; but an examination of all the facts will show that that quotation has no relation whatever to the incident under discussion. The only authority cited by Keim is the passage in Buxtorf referred to by Geikie, whilst the others merely *assume* its existence, without any citations.

The only *scriptural* proof that such a custom was then in vogue ever attempted is the citation of Gen. xxvii. and xlviii. 14-20, which relate to events which took place, the one (*circa*) 1797 years, and the other 1726 years, before, in a different age, patriarchal in its character, in which primitive customs continued in full force.

An explanation of the first of those instances (Gen. xxvii.) is not far to seek nor hard to find. Isaac's "eyes were dim, so that he could not see" (Gen. xxvii. 1); and, therefore, Jacob, "a smooth man," could easily palm himself off on him

¹ Taken from Buxtorf's *Synagoga Judaica*.

as and for Esau, who was a "hairy man" (ver. 11), even though Isaac felt him (ver. 12), by means of the simple trick of putting "the skins of the kids of the goats upon his hands, and upon the smooth of his neck" (ver. 16), which, together with the "goodly raiment of her elder son Esau, which were with her in the house," which Rebekah put upon Jacob her younger son (ver. 15), produced the smell and feeling of Esau (ver. 22, 27), and deceived the sightless old man, in spite of the fact that he thought the voice was that of Jacob (ver. 22). Thus, we see that no custom of laying on of hands in connection with a benediction or blessing is here implied, it being most natural that Isaac, whose "eyes were dim, so that he could not see," should endeavor to determine the identity of the person presenting himself for a blessing by feeling his hands and neck, especially when he noted a difference in the voice and knew that the one he desired to bless was a hairy man (ver. 11, 22).

Besides, as well said by a writer in Kitto's "Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature," "the patriarchal blessings of sons were, in fact, prophecies rather than blessings."

Waiving any objection that might be urged against the use of an incident of patriarchal times to prove the existence of a rabbinical custom in the time of our Lord, we admit that, at first sight, the fact that Jacob laid his hands on the heads of Ephraim and Manasseh when blessing them (Gen. xlviii. 14-20) seems to have greater pertinency.

This being the sole instance in Scripture, however, where a blessing was connected with the laying on of hands, we are induced to scrutinize the matter more closely. At this time, Jacob was one hundred and forty-seven years old (Gen. xlvii. 9, 28); moreover, he was sick (Gen. xlviii. 1), dim-sighted, "so that he could not see" (xlviii. 8, 10), and unable

to stand, but able only, by a special effort ("Israel strengthened himself," ver 2), to *sit* upon the bed (Gen. xlviii. 2). Thus did he receive Joseph and his two sons, everything betokening the very greatest degree of weakness and physical incapacity on the part of Jacob. Is it surprising, then, if Jacob, instead of "spreading forth his hands to heaven," i. e., holding them aloft over the lads' heads (as we shall shortly show to have been the custom in blessing from then to the time of our Lord's sojourn on earth), suffered them to droop, or purposely did not undertake to spread them forth to heaven, but laid them on the lads' heads as a rest or support for them, feeling and well-knowing his inability to sustain them in the air, without some sort of support for them, while pronouncing his blessing? (It should be noted, also, that, inasmuch as Jacob was *sitting* on his bed, according to verse 2, the lads' heads were, in this instance, at just about the height where his feeble hands would naturally come if stretched out in the most natural and comfortable position.) This is by no means an isolated instance of hands being upheld by extraneous support. When Israel contended with Amalek, Moses, in the mount, held his hands aloft until weariness caused them to droop. Whilst his hands were aloft, Israel prevailed; but, when they drooped, Amalek prevailed. Aaron and Hur, therefore, in order that Israel might gain the day, stood beside Moses, and Aaron supported one hand, and Hur the other (Ex. xvii. 11-12). See, also, Job iv. 3; Isa. xxxv. 3; Heb. xii. 12.

It cannot be said that our Lord "blessed" the children in the sense of pronouncing a benediction upon them, as is claimed, this thought being negatived by the very fact that "he laid his hands on them" (Matt. xix. 15). It was not the customary form in which a benediction or blessing was be-

stowed for the dignitary to lay his hands upon the person he blessed, but to lift them up, as we read in Luke xxiv. 50 (the only occasion when our Lord is said to have pronounced a blessing on any one): "And he *lifted up his hands* and blessed them." This was the ordinary priestly form of benediction, such as the people awaited from Zacharias (Luke i. 21), as we see from Lev. ix. 22, where its institution is recorded: "And Aaron *lifted up his hand towards* the people." (The words of blessing are to be found in Num. vi. 22-27.) The hands were spread up to heaven in pronouncing the benediction or blessing (1 Kings viii. 54-55), which is a form in use in benedictions up to the present day.

Having shown from the Holy Scriptures the form in which blessings were bestowed among the Jews, there can be no objection to the insertion of a few quotations from the Old Testament Apocrypha, the Talmud, and one or two other ancient sources of information concerning Jewish *customs*, giving us slightly more detail concerning the custom in question. And first we will quote Ecclus. i. 20: "Then he went down, and lifted up his hands over the whole congregation of the children of Israel, to give the blessing of the Lord with his lips, and to rejoice in his name."

In the Talmud, we find the following:—

"In what way is the sacerdotal blessing performed? . . . In the provinces, the priests raise their hands on a level with their shoulders, but in the temple above their heads, except the high-priest, who does not raise his hands above the diadem [or, perhaps, rather a plate of gold worn on his forehead, the reason of the prohibition in this case being the presence on the plate of the Sacred Name]" (Mishna Sota, vii. 6).

The commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy known as Sifree gives the following directions: (1) the blessing to be

pronounced in Hebrew; (2) the blesser to stand; (3) *with outstretched hands*, etc.

The ancient commentary on Numbers, Bammidbar Rabbî (chap. xi.), tells us:—

"At the time when the Holy One, blessed be He, said to Aaron and his sons, 'Thus shall ye bless,' etc., Israel said to the Holy One, 'Lord of the Universe, Thou tellest the priests to bless us; we want only Thy blessing and to be blessed from Thy mouth, according as it is said, Look from the abode of Thy holiness, from heaven' (Deut. xxvi. 15). The Holy One said, 'Although I commanded the priests to bless you, I am standing with them and blessing you.' Therefore, the priests *stretch forth their hands* to indicate that the Holy One stands behind us, and, therefore, it says, 'He looks from the windows' (Cant. ii. 9) [i.e., from between the shoulders of the priests]. 'He peeps from the lattice work' [i.e., from between the fingers of the priests, the fingers being arranged in pairs: forefingers with middle fingers, ring fingers with little fingers, with the tips of the two thumbs and of the two forefingers, respectively, touching each other, thus arranging the whole ten fingers in six divisions. *Lekach Tob* of R. Eleazer b. Tobiah (the so-called *Pesikta Zotarta*) on Numbers]."

In ancient art, the act of blessing was always so represented. Our Lord's hands are extended *over* the demoniac's head in the bas-reliefs of a sarcophagus at Verona¹ and, also, over a kneeling figure in an arcosolium of the cemetery of St. Hermes.²

From the foregoing, it would appear to be conclusively established that the very fact that we are told that Jesus "laid his hands on them" negatives the thought that he pronounced a benediction, or blessing, on them, because, if "he laid his hands *on* them," he necessarily did not "lift up his hands" *over* them, or "spread forth his hands to heaven."

So far from the Jews having had a *custom* of laying hands on the head of a person in blessing, that act seems to have been especially connected, in so far as any *custom* is con-

¹ Maffei, *Verona Illustrata*, pars III. p. 54.

² Bottari, *Pitture e Sculture*, clxxxvii. No. 2.

cerned, with that which was very different from blessing, i. e., stoning. So far as the Old Testament affords information on the subject of the *customs* of the Jews as regards the laying on of hands, it appears that there were but three *customs* in which the imposition of hands played a part. There was the undoubted custom of laying the hand or hands on the offerings in connection with the sacrifices. The following are all the passages in the Old Testament in which that custom is mentioned: Ex. xxix. 10, 15, 19; Lev. i. 4; iii. 2, 8, 13; iv. 4, 15, 24, 29, 33; viii. 14, 18, 22; xvi. 21; Num. viii. 10-12; 2 Chron. xxix. 23. Another such custom was in connection with the prophets' miracles of healing (*vide supra et infra*). The only other such custom was that of laying hands on the head of a person in connection with stoning, referred to in the following passages: Lev. xxiv. 14; Deut. xiii. 9; xvii. 7; Acts vii. 57-58: "Bring forth him that hath cursed without the camp; and let all the people that heard him lay their hands on his head, and let all the congregation stone him." This may be said to be the opposite of blessing. Besides the passages above cited, there are, in the Old Testament (we have already discussed the New Testament references), a large number of references to the laying on of hands, or the hand, but chiefly in a figurative sense; as, in violence (Gen. xxii. 12; xxxvii. 22, 27; xlix. 8; Josh. ii. 19; 1 Sam. xviii. 17; xxiv. 12-13; 2 Kings xi. 16; 2 Chron. xxiii. 15; Neh. xiii. 21; Esther ii. 21; iii. 6; vi. 2; viii. 7; ix. 2, 16; Job xli. 8; Isa. xi. 14; Obad. 13); judgment (Ex. vii. 4-5; ix. 3; 1 Sam. vi. 3, 5, 9; 1 Chron. xxi. 17; Ezra viii. 18, 22, 31; Jer. li. 25; Ezek. vi. 14; xxv. 13, 16; xxxix. 2, 21; Zeph. i. 4; Zech. ii. 9); discipline or trial (testing) (Job i. 11; ii. 5; ix. 33; xix. 21; Ps. xxxii. 4; lxxx. 17); as an expression for filling with, or direction by, the Holy Spirit in service (1 Kings xviii.

46; 2 Kings iii. 15; Ezek. i. 3; iii. 14, 22; viii. 1; xxxiii. 22; xxxvii. 1; xl. 1). Twice do we read in the Old Testament of the laying on of hands to heal (2 Kings iv. 34; v. 11); twice of the person's own hand being laid on her or his head, as a token of shame or sorrow (2 Sam. xiii. 19; Jer. ii. 37); and once of an angel's hand being laid upon a man to awaken him from sleep (Dan. x. 10). We do not find that hands were laid on Aaron, his sons, or any of the priests in their consecration (Ex. xxviii.; xxix.; Lev. viii.); but we do read that the Lord commanded Moses to lay his hand upon Joshua, in designating him as his successor; and that Moses did so (Num. xxvii. 18, 23); furthermore, that a spirit of wisdom filled Joshua as a result thereof (Deut. xxxiv. 9), the Spirit being in him prior to the laying on of Moses' hands (Num. xxvii. 18). In other words, God caused the mantle or spirit of wisdom which had been Moses' to pass to Joshua, as, in like manner, the mantle and power of Elijah passed to Elisha at a later day, and "the spirit of Elijah rested on Elisha" (2 Kings viii. 13-15). The other passages in the Old Testament which, more or less remotely (and generally figuratively), refer to the laying on of hands, or the hand, in any sense, are the following: Gen. xlv. 4 (cf. Num. xxii. 5, margin, 11); 2 Sam. vi. 6; 2 Kings xiii. 16; 1 Chron. xiii. 9-10; Esther ix. 10, 15; Job xxi. 5; xxviii. 9; xxix. 9; xl. 4; Ps. cxxxix. 5; Prov. xxx. 32; xxxi. 19; Isa. xi. 8; Micah vii. 16; Zech. xiii. 7.

An examination of all these passages (which are all in the Old Testament which even remotely refer to the subject) will make it clear that the laying on of hands was a custom in use among the Jews: (1) in connection with their sacrifices, and (2) in connection with the stoning of one who had broken the law of God, and (3) in connection with works of

healing; *but not in connection with blessing*. This practice in connection with the two things first mentioned continued until the destruction of Jerusalem, by the Romans under Titus, and dissolution of the Jewish state, because it was an integral and important part of their written law with relation to the two things named; and we have already shown that Jesus himself continued the use of the third of the above-named customs, the laying on of hands in connection with works of healing.

If, then, no custom of laying on of hands in blessing existed at that time, why does Mark inform us that Jesus "blessed them" (Mark x. 16)? This is a fair question, and shall be fairly answered. To answer it, it will be necessary to ascertain what light the Scriptures elsewhere throw upon the subject of blessing.

Whilst the primary idea connected with blessing is, undoubtedly, that which is conveyed by the accounts of Isaac's blessing of Jacob and Jacob's blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh, still the term "bless" early received the secondary sense of "salute," as is most clearly shown by Gen. xlvii. 7 and 10, and is occasionally so rendered in the A.V. (1 Sam. xiii. 10; xxv. 14; 2 Kings iv. 29; x. 15), though not so frequently, as has been said by others, as it might have been (e. g., Gen. xxvii. 23; xlvii. 7, 10; 1 Kings viii. 66).

This secondary signification of the term "bless" arose from the fact that salutations consisted of various expressions of blessing; as, "God be gracious unto thee" (Gen. xliii. 29); "The Lord be with you"; "The Lord bless thee" (Ruth ii. 4); "Blessed be thou of the Lord" (Ruth iii. 10; 1 Sam. xv. 13); "The blessing of the Lord be upon you; we bless you in the name of the Lord" (Ps. cxxix. 8). The salutation at parting consisted originally of simple blessing

(Gen. xxiv. 60; xxviii. 1; xlvii. 10; Josh. xxii. 6; 2 Sam. vi. 18); but, in later times, we are told, the term *shalom* was introduced (it had long theretofore been used in the greeting) in the form "go in peace," or, rather, "farewell" (1 Sam. i. 17; xx. 42; 2 Sam. xv. 9). This was current at the time of our Saviour's ministry (Mark v. 34; Luke vii. 50; Acts xvi. 36), and was, possibly, adopted by him in his parting address (John xiv. 27), the Hebrew term being carried over into the Greek.¹

The Hebrew term "bless" (*barak*), after acquiring its secondary significance, spoken of above, was likewise carried over, through the Septuagint, into the Greek, and is represented by the word *εὐλολέω* in the passage before us (Thayer). As a writer in Kitto remarks, "The word *barak*, which originally signified 'to bless,' meant, also, 'to salute,' or 'to welcome,' and 'to bid adieu' (Gen. xlvii. 8-11; 2 Kings iv. 29)."

To say, therefore, that "he blessed them" (Mark x. 16) and "departed thence" (Matt. xix. 15) is the equivalent of saying that he bade them adieu, by saying to them "Go in peace," or using some similar form of parting salutation, and, possibly, lifting up his hands *over* them (not specifically mentioned in the passage) after the manner of oriental salutations, as, in like manner, we read that, at Bethany, our Lord blessed the disciples and was "carried up into heaven," this being his parting salutation to the disciples on his departure from them (Luke xxiv. 50). See, also, for other New Testament instances of the merging of blessing and salutation,

¹ W. L. Bevan, on this, says: "The Greek expression [Go in peace] is evidently borrowed from the Hebrew, the proposition *על* not betokening the state into which, but answering to the Hebrew *ב* in which the person departs" (Smith, Bible Dictionary, p. 1098).

Matt. xxiii. 39; Luke xiii. 35; Matt. xxi. 9; Mark xi. 9; Luke xix. 38; John xii. 13; Ps. cxviii. 26.

Summing up, we are justified, we think, in repeating that the parents of these particular children brought them to Jesus "that he might lay his hands on them," to the end that they might be cured of disease, and that "he laid his hands on them," curing them, and saluted them, and "departed thence."

II.

We now turn to the other branch of our subject—the spiritual signification; for, undeniably, there is a spiritual significance to the words of our Lord, "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." We shall now endeavor briefly to show what that meaning, according to Scripture, is. We believe that a prevalent misconception concerning the nature of the historical fact has obscured this spiritual teaching. If we have in the foregoing shown the true character of this incident, and shown it to be devoid of mystical, imaginary, or undefined meaning, we can with the fewer words point out what is implied in the invitation to come unto him which Christ here extends to little children. We do not limit that invitation to the particular children then in his presence, although the words, especially as rendered in the R.V., might seem to *allow* such interpretation: "Suffer *the* little children," etc., in every occurrence of the phrase. We believe that there is more in it than that, and that we miss teaching of value unless we see in these words an invitation to come unto him to children of all time. He who had said, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt. xi. 28), here tells little children that the same gracious invitation holds good for them. Neither years

nor righteousness are requisite for *coming unto him*; all, whether old or young, rich or poor, learned or unlearned, are possessed of the one qualification which enables them to know that this invitation is addressed to them. They all are sinners. If the Saviour says to all mankind, toiling in the slavery of sin, "*Come unto me*, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," etc., and we understand by that invitation (as we must) that he invites all men to believe on him, and (Rom. v. 1), "being justified by faith, have peace with God" ("rest"), what shall we understand when the Saviour speaks of little children, saying: "*Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me*," etc.? If the *coming* in the one case is by faith, is it not equally so in the other? In the first instance, all men are invited to come to Christ, manifestly in a spiritual sense and by faith in him; in the other, those who had shown that spirit which would prevent the little ones' believing on him, were expressly instructed to suffer them to come unto him. The invitation which had theretofore been general to all mankind is here defined to include the little children. Such little children as sought to know him were to be allowed to acquaint themselves with him and be at peace (Job xxii. 21); for "this is life eternal that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (John xvii. 3). Notwithstanding their youth, no one was to say them nay.

Plain as all this is, we do not rest content until we have examined all passages of Holy Scripture where coming to Christ is mentioned, in order that Scripture itself may determine the meaning of the expression. The fact is that, in every case where such invitation to come to him is extended, or the matter in any way referred to, the *coming* is plainly by faith in him, and not otherwise. Strange it would be,

therefore, if, in this single passage of the Word of God, coming to Christ should mean going to Sunday-school; baptism; the infantile saying of formal prayers in spite of the fact that the prayers of believers only are heard of God (John ix. 31; Ps. lxvi. 18); etc. The passages where coming to Christ is referred to are as follows: Matt. xi. 28-30; John v. 40; vi. 35, 37-40, 44-45, 65; vii. 37-39; xiv. 6. (Cf. John xiii. 33, which may be of some importance as showing that "little children," whether that term be used in a literal or a figurative sense, cannot *now* come to Christ in any but a spiritual sense.) In order that the full force of these passages may be realized, some of them will be here quoted:—

"And ye will not *come unto me* that ye might have life" (John v. 40).

"And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life. He that *cometh to me* shall never hunger, and he that *believeeth on me* shall never thirst. . . . All that the Father hath given me shall *come to me*; and him that *cometh to me* I will in no wise cast out. . . . No man can *come to me*, except the Father which hath sent me draw him. . . . Every man, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, *cometh unto me*" (John vi. 35, 37, 44-45).

"But there are some of you that *believe not*. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that *believed not*, and who should betray him. And he said, Therefore, said I unto you, that no man can *come unto me*, except it were given unto him of my Father" (John vi. 64-65).

From the passages already quoted, it will be seen that the expression "come unto me" is used as and for, and as synonymous with, "believe on me"; they are used interchangeably; and they are so used as to indicate that all who had "come" to Christ, in the special sense indicated by these passages, had "believed" on him, the expressions being synonymous as used in these Scriptures. That spiritual coming, by faith, is meant, is plainly to be seen, from the fact that there were some, like Judas Iscariot, who had *come*, so

far as their bodies were concerned, but who are expressly said to be unable to *come* (by faith), because not given to them of the Father (see John vi. 64, 65, 66, 70-71).

We merely refer to the passage (John xiv. 6) where we read that Jesus said, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; no man *cometh* unto the Father but by me" (which can certainly be taken in none but a spiritual sense), and pass on to the final quotation on this point:—

"In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him *come unto me* and drink. *He that believeth on me*, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that *believe on him* should receive" (John vii. 37-39).

Nothing could make plainer the usage of our Lord and Scripture, that they speak of coming to Christ and believing in him as one and the same thing, both resulting in the gift of the Holy Ghost, the two expressions being used interchangeably in the passage just quoted and in others.

With this many would agree. All we maintain is, that, when Christ says, "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me," the expression "come unto me" means the same thing as we have shown that it elsewhere in Scripture always means. This thought is confirmed, if it need confirmation, by the language of our Lord, when he speaks of "little ones which believe in me" (Matt. xviii. 6). It is unnecessary to discuss how any one could forbid the children to believe in him, or the likelihood of their doing so. That it could be done, and that stumbling-blocks could be placed in the way of children on account of their youth, is apparent and well known to all. It has, moreover, been done. Tertullian, for instance, says: "Why should the innocent [?] age hasten to the forgiveness of sins? How can

we think of entrusting heavenly things to that age to which we cannot entrust earthly things?" Children are often relegated to a supposed limbo, whence it is not expected they will emerge until they have reached years (not of discretion, but) of maturity. They are, in the meantime, the recipients of a certain amount of instruction about the Bible, perchance, but generally none about Christ as a divine Saviour for them, to whom they may come by faith, any tendency towards spiritual awakening being quenched by stock phrases, such as: "You are probably mistaken"; "You are too young to understand such things"; "Wait until you are older"; etc. This, some euphemistically call "bringing up the child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord"; but we fear it rather falls short of the scriptural injunction to that effect (Eph. vi. 4). We should rather say that, in addition, distinct teaching concerning Christ as a personal Saviour for the little children would come within the scriptural requirement. This teaching could be beautifully enforced by an express appeal to the Saviour's own special invitation to the little children to come unto him (believe on him), and the safeguard which he had mercifully provided for those "little ones which believe" in him, in the announcement of a special woe to such as should cause one such little one to stumble. The children may come to Christ, because the terms of his invitation to all mankind are so broad that they include children. He says: "Come unto me, *all* ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." He assures us, furthermore, that "him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out." Both these blessed statements include children; but we can go further. Lest any one might misunderstand the breadth of his offer of salvation, which extends even to the man whose sins may be "as scarlet," and to the woman whose guilt may be "red

like crimson" (Isa. i. 18), and say, "Children are too young and are not included," he expressly invites the little ones to believe on him, saying, "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

It is certainly a misuse of this beautiful invitation to personal faith in the crucified Redeemer to say that this text sanctions the baptism of unbelieving (because unintelligent) infants; that it sanctions the practice of teaching unbelieving (because unintelligent) infants to repeat formal prayers, when those prayers necessarily cannot be heard by God, because not "mixed with faith"; or to say that the children are thereby invited to come to Sunday-school. Far be it from us to decry that instrumentality for bringing souls to Christ; but, for the sake of scriptural accuracy, we merely wish to say that, to come to Sunday-school is not the same thing as to come to Christ; and the passage we have been considering is an invitation to come to Christ.

It only remains to consider the objections which may be raised to the view we have here advocated.

Briefly stated, they turn upon the age of the children brought to Christ "that he should put his hands on them and pray"; because Mark and Luke make it appear that the lesson of humility illustrated by a little child was given in connection with the miracle of healing above discussed and the Saviour's words, "Suffer little children," etc. This, then, connects the disjointed narratives of Matt. xviii. 1-6 and Matt. xix. 13-15, and gives us this fact, that the little ones brought to Christ at this time are used by him as examples of "little ones which believe" in him, even if he does not expressly affirm that those particular little ones did believe in him, as we may fairly take it he does, when he says: "*this*

little child" (Matt. xviii. 4); "one *such* little child" (ver. 5); and, "whoso shall offend one of *these* little ones which believe in me" (ver. 6).

The alleged force of the objection under consideration is said to reside in this, that, whilst Matthew and Mark merely speak of "little children" (*παιδία*) being brought to our Lord, Luke speaks of "infants," or "babes," as the R.V. has it (*βρέφη*), this objection being urged by Whitby as conclusive on the subject. Strength is added to this argument, it is claimed, by the fact that we read (Mark x. 16) that "he took them up in his arms," implying, it is said, that they were very little, indeed—mere babes, in fact. But we read, also, that he took up in his arms the child mentioned in Mark ix. 36 and Matt. xviii. 3 (who Nicephorus supposes, probably incorrectly, to have been Ignatius, afterwards bishop of Antioch). This last-named child was certainly no new-born babe, as is distinctly shown by the fact that it could walk. The child could walk, we know, because it is written, "Jesus *called* a little child *unto him*" (Matt. xviii. 2). As for the age of the "little children" (*παιδία*), it is sufficient to call attention to the fact that the same word here translated "little children" is rendered "damsel" in Mark v. 39-42. That "damsel," when raised from the dead, was able to walk: "and straightway the damsel arose and walked, for she was of the age of twelve years" (ver. 42). In other words, the "little children" of Matt. xviii. 1-6; xix. 13-15; and Mark x. 13-16, may have been as much as twelve years old, like the "damsel" of Mark v. 39-42, both "little children" and "damsel" being represented by the same Greek word. We merely comment, in passing, that a child is certainly at years of discretion and responsibility at the age of twelve years, and susceptible to conviction of sin, and capable

of personal faith in Christ.

No difficulty being presented by the expression "little children," we hasten to take up that of "infants," or "babes" (*βρέφη*), in Luke. It may, in the first place, not be amiss to call attention to the fact that, having determined the possible age of the "little children," *supra*, our work is done, so far as the objection in question is concerned; for Christ does not say, even in Luke's narrative, "Suffer the infants" (or "babes") "to come unto me," but concurs with the accounts of Matthew and Mark in saying, "Suffer little children," etc., which is enough for our exposition, the Greek word here in Luke being *παιδιά*, as in Matthew and Mark, and not *βρέφη*, the word translated "infants," or "babes." Even the English word "infant" has a rather extended signification, and, in one sense, covers an age of more than twenty years. The Greek word which is here so translated is not narrowly limited in its meaning, it would seem, being variously translated in the A.V., "babe," "infant," "young child," and "child." But a most significant fact is that the word applied to Timothy in 2 Tim. iii. 15 is the same which is here translated "infants" (A.V.), or "babes" (R.V.). In that passage, Paul says to Timothy, "from a *child*, thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus." It is needless to say that "a mere babe" (Whitby) is hardly capable of knowing the Scriptures, and that probably even Timothy's knowledge of the Holy Scriptures did not begin much prior to his arrival at what we should term years of discretion, a period subject to considerable variation in different children.

But, even allowing this objection the fullest force that can be claimed for it, it does not militate against our view.

Luke says that "infants" ("babes," R.V.—*βρέφη*) were brought to him; Matthew and Mark, "little children" (*παιδία*). Why may not *both* have been brought to him? When Matthew and Mark tell us that "little children" were brought to him, they do not say that "babes," also, were *not* brought to him. On the other hand, Luke, in saying that "babes" were brought to him, does not deny that "little children," also, may have been brought with the others. "In ordinary cases," says Rawlinson, "and more particularly in cases where brevity has been studied, mere silence proves absolutely nothing." It must not be forgotten that different eye-witnesses of the same event notice different details of the attendant circumstances. Infidels have made use of this kind of argument in their endeavors to discredit the historical character of the narratives of the four Gospels, pretending that the mere omission by one evangelist of a fact mentioned by another is a discrepancy; as, here, Matthew and Mark affirm that "little children (*παιδία*) were brought to him, whilst Luke says that still smaller children, "babes" (*βρέφη*), were brought to him. There is here, however, no contradiction or discrepancy; for Luke does not deny the presence there of "little children" older than the "babes" he mentions; nor do Matthew and Mark affirm that "babes" were not there as well as "little children." "The weak character of the argument *a silentio* is now admitted by all tolerable critics," again says Rawlinson, though Strauss's "Life of Jesus" is full of just such fallacious reasoning in his elaborate attempt to prove Christianity to be founded on a myth. Thus, if we take, for example, the second of the sections in which Strauss expressly undertakes the consideration of the (alleged) "disagreements of the canonical gospels," we shall find, among other things, the following enumeration of so-

called discrepancies in relation to the Annunciation:—

"1. The individual who appears is called; in Matthew, an angel of the Lord; in Luke, the angel Gabriel. 2. The person to whom the angel appears is, according to Matthew, Joseph; according to Luke, Mary. 3. In Matthew, the apparition is seen in a dream; in Luke, while awake. 4. There is a discrepancy with respect to the time at which the apparition took place. 5. Both the purpose of the apparition, and the effect, are different."

The obvious explanation of all this is, that both Joseph and Mary had visions; Matthew records the one, and Luke, the other. The silence of Matthew cannot be taken to mean that Mary saw no vision; nor can Luke's silence disprove the fact that an angel appeared to Joseph in a dream. Both accounts are true and accurate, but refer to separate and distinct events.

In like manner, we say, we cannot assume that all the children brought to Christ at this time were "babes," on the authority of Luke, any more than we can be allowed to ignore the "babes," mentioned by Luke, and say that they were all "little children," on the authority of Matthew. What we do say is, that *both* may have been brought to our Lord.

It is not germane to our subject to discuss the lesson of humility given by our Lord and illustrated by a little child, though we may, in conclusion, briefly refer to it.

"Children are proper emblems of the humble, unambitious, submissive, and dependent spirit which is the essence and excellence of genuine Christianity [Christian character]," says Scott. And there is an evident connection between the words of our Lord, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 3), and the words of our Lord, "Except ye become converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xviii. 3). "Men in understanding," "in malice

children" (1 Cor. xiv. 20), children of God, "as new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby" (1 Pet. ii. 2), remembering that there are but two things mentioned in God's most holy and perfect Word which are said, by him, to be "of great price"; namely, "the pearl of great price" (Matt. xiii. 46), the inexpressible preciousness of which to Christ we all know, and "a meek and quiet spirit, which, in the sight of God, is of great price" (1 Pet. iii. 5).

ARTICLE III.

THE RISE OF THE TOLERATION MOVEMENT.

BY FRANKLIN C. CLARK, A.M., M.D., PROVIDENCE,
RHODE ISLAND.

DOWN to the opening of the seventeenth century, religious intolerance was the order of the day. The human mind was held fast under the thrall of the spiritual power, and confined to a narrow channel to abandon which was perilous in the extreme. With sword and fagot the church maintained its claim to divine authority; but, in thus appealing to human weapons, it entirely ignored the human side of the question. However, this spiritual intolerance was not the exclusive possession of medieval ecclesiasticism. The maternal hierarchy had well instructed its offspring in the use of weapons which they, in their turn, were not slow to wield in upholding the authority of their own doctrines. And, even when transplanted to a new soil, whither they had sailed to escape persecution for maintaining offensive dogmas at home, and to obtain, in that distant wild, "freedom to worship God" according to their own interpretation of it, these very sectaries, despite their former sufferings for their religious belief, there failed to learn the lesson of toleration. "When the charge of persecution," observes Guizot, "was applied to the ruling party in the Reformation, not by its enemies, but by its own offspring; when the sects, denounced by that party, said, 'We are doing just what you did; we separate ourselves from you, just as you separated yourselves from the Church of Rome'; this ruling party was still more at a loss

to find an answer; and frequently the only answer they had to give was an increase of severity." The very liberty of conscience which they had demanded for themselves, did they, when their opportunity came, deny to all who should differ from them. The reconciliation of the different religious sectaries belonged to a period in the dim future.

But the Reformation was not altogether a religious movement, as it marked a great and far-reaching crisis in human thought. It constituted the first successful attempt to throw off the shackles whereby the human mind might regain its freedom. The first step made towards the accomplishment of this result was the overthrow of that spiritual power that had for centuries sat like an incubus on humanity and precluded all hope of material prosperity. Though this spiritual freedom was by no means complete, yet the first step had been taken; a break had been made from the old order of things. Conditions and environment, the character of the ruler and of the ruled, have all, in a greater and less degree, delayed the total emancipation of the mind. But the mind was at least awakened to a just sense of its needs both in religious and in temporal matters. There was now no going backward; the old order of things would never return. That was, certainly, some consolation.

Now, as this Reformation was accomplished under a religious garb, religion was given a new importance and a new direction in all the relations of life. On the one hand, secular governments began to take Christianity under their special protection, while their respective rulers endeavored to become veritable popes in their methods of securing uniformity of belief. On the other side, the variety of religious doctrines, to which the emancipation of the human mind had naturally given rise, found expression in a multiplicity of sects that

denied to each other the same privilege of dissent, which they had demanded for themselves, and backed their arguments, when they had the power, by appealing to the temporal sword, slashing right and left in imitation of their former task-masters. The only religious liberty thus far enunciated was the liberty of using their newly acquired power in coercing all those who disagreed with them,—the right of the strongest. However, those who could thus force their doctrines upon others without their consent could make it a merit to die as well as to fight for their cause. Thus the various sectaries can point to numerous martyrs who suffered in maintaining and repressing religious freedom alike. But it is a sad reflection on those distressful times, to note those infatuated religionists, at the very moment of their recovery of spiritual liberty, flying to arms and cutting one another's throats for no other reason than for some slight difference of opinion in non-essentials, some point of rubric or ceremony!

In France and the Netherlands religious toleration was secured only through the mutual concessions of opposing factions. Political reasons, as much as the sheer exhaustion of the contending parties, hastened that event. A mild Christian spirit had nothing to do whatever with the change of attitude.

In Holland the struggle between Romanism and Protestantism lasted until the power of Spain, the mere tool of Rome, had been totally shattered. The deadly blow which Spain had intended to inflict upon Protestant Christendom rebounded on herself and paralyzed all her energies, from which blow she has never recovered. Yet Holland presents an unique example in the history of the Toleration movement. From the year 1575 on, the persecuted religionists of every shade and of every nationality here found safe har-

borage where each might exercise his peculiar belief with impunity. Thousands of fugitives from England alone, counting many Roman Catholics among them, obtained here a toleration they could not find at home. But it must be admitted that these very exiles would have abetted any persecution of the other religious sectaries in their own country whenever their own party should be in the ascendant; and they did so when the coast was clear enough to return home and coöperate with their co-religionists.

Turning back to France for a moment, we find that toleration was a purely political measure on the part of Henry IV., to secure the peace of the realm, not from any conscientious motives on his part. The Huguenots at this time formed in France a party more powerful than the Romish, and were able to obtain toleration at the point of the sword so long as they had the power. But, on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the Romish party was once more in the ascendant, at which time thousands of persecuted Huguenots were driven from France, and settled in America, chiefly in the English colonies.

Passing on to England, we shall note there, for a period of nearly two centuries, the same unremitting attempts to secure uniformity in matters of religion by coercion, which was met by a no less corresponding nonconformity on the part of the persecuted, and rendered the struggle between the different factions one of most intense bitterness. A consideration of the causes which led to the full establishment of religious toleration in England and in her American colonies will explain on a small arena the rise of the toleration movement. The chief factors in accomplishing this event are to be found in the conflict of the various politico-ecclesiastical parties into which the advocates of the several religious

sectaries were divided during what is known as the reformatory period. Therefore, if we consider the rise and development of these parties of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, we shall be the better enabled to trace the toleration movement both in England and our own country.

Of the many political parties which arose during this period, five attained more or less prominence at different times, and were active in shaping public opinion in regard to the toleration of religion. The minor parties exerted but little or no influence, or else constituted smaller subdivisions of the more powerful factions, and, hence, do not require any special mention. The five parties under consideration were as follow :—

I. The Popish, or the old conservative party,—the intolerant spirit against which England was first to protest, and which for a hundred and fifty years was a constant menace to English liberties and English reform. It constituted the party of intrigue, was ever ready to accept of any change in the political horizon, provided such change afforded advantage to the principles it advocated, and was, so to speak, the denational party, prepared at any time to overturn the existing condition of things to secure its ends; and, for this purpose, it would endeavor to conciliate its enemies when out of power, and to betray them again when once more taken into favor. Thus this party was ever on the side of power, especially when that power should subserve its interests.

II. Anglicanism constituted the second powerful party. It was a protest, the first, against all foreign interference with English institutions,—a declaration that the sovereign possessed the indisputable right to rule his subjects according to the law of the land, whether in temporal or in religious

concerns; an affirmation of the supremacy of the state in all things against individual rights or foreign intervention. This, in turn, became the conservative party, and was as intolerant in the course of time as had ever been the old Romish party. Hence, the same animadversions which were once directed against the Papal became equally applicable at length to the Anglican party.

III. The Puritans proper, who formed the great bulk of the Puritan party, apart from their desire of religious reform, adopted no less arbitrary methods than the other two parties to weaken the royal supremacy, following the example of the Anglicans in their struggle with the papal hierarchy. In its political capacity this party represented pure republicanism, the first of the kind to find expression on English soil. It exhibited its political side more definitely, in this regard, in Presbyterianism, where it would have both church and state legislated by an assembly,—the first ruled by synods and the second by a parliament. But it departed somewhat from a pure democracy in the fact that it advocated that both synod and parliament should be placed under the control of a spiritual, or ecclesiastical, oligarchy instead of giving obedience to a single head. But it had no intention, however, of tolerating any religious belief which did not accord with its own form. The Puritan party could not, therefore, use language strong enough to express its hatred of “lawless toleration.” Nevertheless, it denominated itself the party of reform.

IV. The Erastians made a vigorous protest against the dawning tendency to republicanism as exhibited by the Presbyterians, who constituted the right wing of the Puritan party, and this irrespective of its religious aspect. The Erastian party declared itself in favor of an absolute monarch

in civil affairs, as being preferable to a tyrannical oligarchy. In matters of religion, however, it favored a perfect toleration and often sided with the Independents.

V. The Independent party, the last under consideration, was distinctively a liberal party. In this party we may first note the glimmerings of true democratic principles both in church and state,—the right, then and there first enunciated, in any political body, for any number of persons to form themselves into whatever religious assembly they might desire; and that every such congregation should constitute a true church organization, to be governed by its own members or by-laws without any let or hindrance from the civil magistrate. This party was the first to proclaim the great principle that religious liberty is the inherent right of man, and that, so long as the civil peace is not disturbed, such liberty should not be curtailed. This enunciation of self-government in ecclesiastical affairs was afterwards reflected in the civil polity, and had its best fruitage in the New World.

The struggle for ascendancy between these several parties was productive not only of English constitutional government, but of the gradual separation of church and state and the recognition of religious freedom, the last two finding their earliest and fullest expression in the English colonies of North America, and now forming a part of the Constitution of the United States.

With this brief introduction, the reader will be the better prepared to enter more at large upon the discussion of this interesting subject, and to note the rôle played by each party in bringing about the very result which the great bulk of these sectaries did all in their power to prevent.

I.

When Thomas Aquinas, the ecclesiastical casuist of the thirteenth century, formulated the doctrine of papal supremacy, which was stereotyped in the sixteenth at the Council of Trent, and gave the Pope of Rome supreme control in both spiritual and temporal concerns alike, a position was assumed by the Church of Rome that clearly evinced its relations with Protestantism from the start,—a policy from which that church has never once swerved a hair's breadth. To the subsequent conflict between Protestantism and Romanism, a struggle which ended in the total freedom of the human mind from ecclesiastical arrogance, may be traced the germs of that antagonism to the Roman Church wherever it has established itself.¹ But, in viewing the Romish party, we must regard it not so much from an ethical standpoint, as in the light of a stupendous political system, such as the world never before knew. When Henry VIII. of England, by his arbitrary act, threw off his allegiance to the Papal See and established a church more subservient to his or to English interests and placed under his direct supervision, it was the first blow struck for religious freedom, in whatever other light it may be considered. This act was the first step made towards religious toleration, and gave rise, in after time, to the colonization of America.

Of the three parties which now held the balance of power, the Roman Catholics were by no means the weakest, if not

¹ See Bull of Gregory XVI. (1832), where he emphasizes the evils of religious toleration and refers to the "pestilent error" of liberty of conscience; also the Encycl. of Pius IX. (1864), which condemns all the principles upon which the United States are founded; also the Encycl. of Leo XIII. (1885 and 1888), wherein this "enlightened prelate" makes similar assertions; also the recent arraignment by the Papal Court of "Modernism."

so strong as the Anglicans, and if we again except the brief lease of power of the Romish party under Mary. But at that time its excesses not only made her name one of the most infamous in history, but, in their carrying out to the full the principles enunciated at the Council of Trent, proved their utter incapacity to govern and their total unworthiness of public confidence.

The Puritans at this time were in a small minority; but they were the staunch upholders of the English Constitution, whatever might have been their disagreement in religious concerns. The general reluctance of the Papal party to swear allegiance to the temporal sovereign, and, as time went on, their refusal to subscribe to any measure which might conflict with the Pope's claim to temporal as well as to spiritual supremacy, kept this party, especially the Jesuitical wing, and the country at large, constantly in hot water, and drew thereby upon the party most of the persecution and proscription to which all the Roman Catholics were subjected. The Puritans did not offend in the same vein.

The evils under which the Papal party in England labored during the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles II., if not entirely undeserved, are evident enough. But it was during the stormy reign of Elizabeth that the Roman Catholics were compelled to endure more than ordinary hardships. The position of the Queen was peculiar. At that time all the popish powers, headed by Spain, were leagued together to make a grand and final effort to blot Protestantism out of existence. The Netherlands were invaded; Elizabeth excommunicated and deposed by the Pope; her subjects absolved from their allegiance to her, and threatened, in their turn, with excommunication in case of their disobedience to the Papal Bull. In short, the Queen's life was placed in con-

stant jeopardy from popish plots, which culminated in the "Invincible Armada," despatched by Spain for the conquest of England and the redemption of lost souls. Under such trying circumstances the penal code enacted against all Roman Catholics who refused to take the oath of allegiance (hence termed *recusants*) was more rigidly enforced. By this law it was made equivalent to treason for a Romish priest to say mass: even those who should take part in its celebration were liable to like penalties. Imprisonments and fines for recusancy were now of constant occurrence on the slightest pretext. And, though the escape of recusants was frequently connived at, the Roman Catholics did not dare to complain of any of these rigorous measures.

Another severe law, passed against recusants at this time, was to the effect that all persons who should absent themselves from the service of the Anglican, or established, Church, unless they should hear the Protestant service at their own homes, were to be fined twenty pounds a month, if their property admitted of such a sum; otherwise they forfeited two-thirds of their lands until such time as they should conform. Those who had no lands to levy on had their personal property attached (1581). Hard as such treatment was, it was made still more severe by the abuses of constables and pursuivants whose business it was to make search for Romish priests who had taken refuge in the families of the Roman Catholic gentry. Under the pretense of looking for concealed priests, these officials were wont to destroy in the most wanton manner the furniture of the houses which they searched, or else to carry away with them much valuable property. The sufferers from such treatment had no redress whatever, as there were but few Romanists who had not given the law some hold on them for more or less assistance extended

to their priests. This was made the occasion when many Roman Catholics, whose tender consciences would not permit them to take the oath of fealty to the Queen, went beyond sea where they could exercise their religion with freedom. Holland furnished that asylum for sects of all complexions, Protestant and Romish alike.

During the same year (1581), another act against recusancy was passed. The year previous, many Jesuits had made their appearance in England; and much, if not all, of the disturbance during the reign of Elizabeth may be attributed to them. The Jesuits and Seminary priests, instructed at Dany, were at the bottom of all these troubles; and but for them the reign of the Queen might have been comparatively tranquil; for they accentuated in every way imaginable the terms of the bull of Pius V., and gave encouragement to all conscientious professors of their faith in their disloyalty to the Queen. Yet it would not be just to deny that the best element among the English Romanists repudiated with indignation all such attempts to shake their loyalty to the English government. After events proved this fact conclusively.

It was this wholesale and indiscriminate persecution of Roman Catholics which cannot be too strongly deprecated, and which must be laid not so much to the necessities of the times as to the intolerant spirit of the age, as the sequel will show. Another point to note is the fact that all statutes enacted against Nonconformists were chiefly directed against recusant priests; the non-juring laity were never so severely dealt with. No one, according to Hallam, could not have preserved his life "by explicitly denying the Pope's power to depose the queen." But the faithful Roman Catholic, rather than to do this, preferred to suffer at the stake and obtain the glorious crown of martyrdom.

On the accession of James, the Romish party was led to expect some mitigation of the severity which had hitherto been exercised towards it. On the eve of succeeding Elizabeth to the throne, James had promised some half-way concessions to all parties, in the hope of attaching them more closely to his interest. To the Roman Catholics in particular he had promised toleration; and, to encourage them the more in this belief, during the first two years of his reign he remitted all fines formerly levied against recusants. The Roman Catholics were in consequence very zealous in his favor. But, whatever he had done to win the favor of that party, James was no admirer of Papists, much less of Jesuits; and on several occasions he declared he should proceed against them in the same manner as had been done in the preceding reign. But if the Romanists found their condition but little lightened, the Puritans had still greater cause of complaint of the severity of the laws against nonconformity. These latter sectaries were not only bitterly opposed to the Romish party, but desired changes to be made in the ritual of the established church. They were, therefore, not persecuted so much for state reasons, as were the Roman Catholics, but for their nonconformity. They had never refused to take the oath of allegiance to the government, but had refused to subscribe to certain forms and ceremonies of the Establishment. The Romanists, on the other hand, would neither submit to the sovereign nor conform. This contumacy on their part made them more difficult of management.

At the beginning of the rule of James, England became the asylum of those Papists who had fled in the previous reign. As many as one hundred and forty priests landed on those shores within nine months after the death of Elizabeth, encouraged to return by the hope of toleration. But in this

hope they were disappointed; for, soon after, the law was put in force against recusancy which was particularly severe in its treatment of priests. The Roman Catholic laity were for a time, at least, tolerated. But this toleration did not last long, for James put into operation all the old laws in this regard, but, apparently, for no other purpose than to use the fines, thus collected on the lands and other property of the Roman Catholics, for pensioning his Scotch favorites. Then it was that many recusants again sought asylum in Holland; while at home, owing to the baneful effect and rank injustice of the laws against recusancy, arose the famous Gunpowder Plot, which was ascribed to the notorious Guy Fawkes. Albeit in this conspiracy only Jesuits were implicated, yet the secular priests, though entirely innocent of any complicity in it, were involved alike in the punishment; and a still more rigorous code of recusant laws was enacted, in which all classes of Roman Catholics were included.

In 1622 the hopes of the Romish party were once more revived when James seemed bent on an alliance with Spain by the proposed marriage of his son Charles with the Infanta. Sir George Calvert, one of his secretaries of state, was most strenuous in his efforts to bring about this match; and he was, besides, a recent convert to the Catholic Church. Among the stipulations asked in concluding this alliance, it was required that the future Queen of England should enjoy the full and free exercise of her faith, and that all her children should be brought up in it. But the article in the agreement that chiefly concerned the Roman Catholics was the promise made whereby James and his son pledged themselves to discontinue all persecution of recusants so long as the latter confined their worship to their own residences. However, the Spanish marriage was finally broken off through the

opposition of the Puritan party. At this time that party was gaining strength; it was mainly through the Puritan interest in Parliament that the alliance was opposed and the King enjoined to seek a Protestant marriage for his son.

Two new parties arose during this reign. They were naturally of a religious complexion, though political in their bearing. Both were old parties with new faces. One was the Country party, wholly composed of Puritans, who were strongly opposed to the absolutism of the king, to the church establishment, and to the Roman Catholics as a matter of course. The second, or Court party, was a conglomerate body, made up of Anglicans, clergy, laity, and those holding offices under the crown, together with the vast majority of Romanists who now found it to their advantage to curry favor with the ruling powers. But, under whatsoever name going, these two parties were to be easily differentiated.

At first the Papal party gained ascendancy over king and court. This made matters all the more uncomfortable to the Puritans, which gave occasion for many of this party in their turn to emigrate to the Low Countries, and thence to New England. However, as the Puritan interest was stronger in the Commons than either of the other two parties (Rornish and Anglican), the Puritans demanded the enforcement of the laws against recusancy. It was then that the Roman Catholics were forced to flee, as the Puritans had done, and seek refuge in Holland among their co-religionists.

During the reign of James a colonizing spirit first made its appearance; though it did not fully develop till in the following reign, having for the most part its birth in religious intoleration. The first of the kind was one proposed by George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore. In this reign he secured a charter from the King for his Palatinate of

Avalon, which at one time appears to have been proposed as the asylum of persecuted Roman Catholics. It will be remembered that Calvert was one of James's secretaries of state, and a recent important convert to Catholicism. But, as Protestants as well as Roman Catholics appear to have gone there, it could not have been an exclusive Roman Catholic retreat. The colony was probably nothing more than an adventure or speculation, like his subsequent colony of Maryland. Again, for state reasons, it could not have been a strictly Popish asylum. No complaints were sent home concerning the celebration there of the rites of the Roman Catholic Church. Lord Baltimore seems to have adopted a more liberal policy, for personal or political reasons; at least a modified toleration was found there. The colony was not, however, a successful experiment.

On the succession of James's son Charles, the hopes of the Romish party were given a new lease of life. On his marriage with Henrietta Maria, the sister of Louis XIII. of France, one of the most bigoted Papists of the age, Charles, as his father had done when contemplating the Spanish match, made promises to tolerate the Romish Church in his kingdom. But the House of Commons, now composed of many prominent members of the Puritan party, petitioned the King to execute the laws enacted against recusants as his father had done before him.

Charles was at this time placed in a most delicate position, requiring the greatest tact to maintain. He had promised the King of France to cease persecuting his Roman Catholic subjects, and at the same time given his solemn word not to tolerate the Papal faith. He was thus placed between two fires. But, whatever his promises may have been to either party, it is certain that the condition of the Romanists during

his whole reign was greatly ameliorated. Notwithstanding the demands of the Puritans in the Commons, Charles was not able to enforce the statutes levied against English Papists; in Ireland it would have been a physical impossibility to have done so.

The fines levied for non-attendance on the established church were now reduced one-half, or else wholly rebated by some sort of composition. The spy system, so obnoxious in the previous reign, was abolished. "The English Catholics affirmed that they never enjoyed so much repose and security as under king Charles." To be sure, they were not entirely exempt from apprehension so long as the penal laws directed against recusancy remained unrepealed and might at any time be put into force; for the Puritans raised a continual cry for their enforcement, and kept the Romish party constantly upon the rack, notwithstanding the assurances of Charles that the enforcement of these statutes formed a part of the royal prerogative. But, as the Puritans were a growing party in Parliament, it was uncertain what legislation might be directed against recusants were these offensive statutes not rescinded.¹ But Charles determined to be master of the situation in every case; and he loved power too well to make any undue concessions.

The Presbyterians, on their side, had now good cause for alarm at the increasing ascendancy of the Court, virtually a Popish, party. From the Netherlands, France, Rome, and Spain, the seats of Roman Catholicism, between seven hundred and eight hundred emissaries had been sent into England,—Jesuits, Seminary priests, and various classes of ecclesiastics. Most of them had been received into the principal families of the country, and had openly professed the Rom-

¹ Ranke, *History of England*, vol. II. pp. 34 ff.

ish faith. The Mass was now boldly celebrated in numberless places and, on special occasions, with all the pomp and magnificence known to their ritual. The Queen, who was herself a Roman Catholic, attended her religious exercises at her own public chapel, and was waited on by Capuchin monks in the dress of their order. Even an agent of the Holy See was stationed at the English court. Roman Catholics found powerful friends among the English nobility and gentry, numbered with whom was the Earl of Arundel, whose daughter had married Cecilius Calvert, son of the first Lord Baltimore, above cited. Add to this the eccentricities and innovations which Bishop Laud had introduced into the Anglican liturgy, and had been countenanced by Charles, together with the King's leaning towards Rome and his attempts at a reconciliation with that Church, and then may be readily explained the strong opposition of the Puritans to the King, as well as the support which the Romish party gave him in emphasizing the royal prerogative. But the opposition of the Commons, and the obstinacy of Charles in maintaining his position as Pope of the Anglican Church, in all probability nipped in the bud the Popish scheme of reuniting the Anglican and Roman churches.

It was during this lull in the persecution of recusants that the first Lord Baltimore obtained his charter of Maryland, the planting of which was left for his son Cecilius. It has usually been supposed that the motive of planting this colony was purely for the purpose of securing a place of refuge for English Roman Catholics, where they might practise unmolested their own form of religious worship. This view was chiefly based on vague notions then prevalent, but without any corroborative evidence. A letter, proceeding from one of Lord Baltimore's Council in Maryland, alludes but slightly

to any such motive for founding the colony; for certain Roman Catholics there had been refused privileges and immunities demanded by them, over and above the other colonists. The fact that Lord Baltimore was himself a Romanist may have given currency to this belief.

Another fact will substantiate the opposite view. There was, during the reign of Charles, never any occasion for the establishment of such an asylum. The persecutions of the Roman Catholics were now less severe than ever before. Furthermore, according to the testimony of Charles Calvert, the third Lord Baltimore, his father Cecilius had found it a matter of considerable difficulty in persuading colonists to emigrate; and the great preponderance of those who eventually did emigrate belonged to the laboring classes and were mostly of the Protestant faith. From this fact we must conclude that the persecution of recusants during this reign was not severe enough to induce many to emigrate when such advantages were held out to them at home.

Thence, down to the close of the Puritan revolution, when Protestantism became firmly established in the realm, the fortunes of the Romish party met with varying success. The encouragement given them by James II. in the Romish reaction was but the calm preceding the storm. Under Parliamentary rule, of which the Puritan party was the moving spirit, a number of severe penal statutes were passed against recusants. Before the break with Charles, Parliament even required the King's assent to measures by which the children of Roman Catholics should be brought up in the Protestant faith. In the falling fortunes of Charles I., the higher classes, and the Roman Catholics in general, took sides with the King, while the balance of power remained with the Commons, where the Puritan element was in the ascendancy.

During the Protectorate (1649–60), the doctrine of toleration, or liberty of conscience, was in the air, and it pleased Cromwell to be the upholder of that doctrine,—in moderation. At the same time the Romish party began to breathe more freely, but only for a brief space; for the times were not yet ripe for the acceptance of any broad interpretation of religious toleration.

After the Restoration, Roman Catholics were generally tolerated in some degree; and, although their hopes rose higher correspondingly in the following reign, so as to have a controlling influence in politics, the deposition of James and the accession of William and Mary to the throne of England dashed all such hopes to the ground. But they were tacitly tolerated along with the other sectaries now denominated together as Nonconformists. But the bitter prejudice entertained towards all Roman Catholics continued for many a long year, though, so far as can be ascertained, that party never gave the government any cause of uneasiness. This prejudice was, undoubtedly, well grounded, and has never as yet been wholly eradicated.

During the rule of Parliament (1642), the Romanists mainly espoused the Puritan cause; some of them even entered the Parliamentary army, fully expecting, should the Puritan cause prevail, that liberty of conscience would be conceded to all parties, irrespective of their religious tenets. The French ambassador used every endeavor to win them over to Charles, but without avail. Lord Baltimore and the Arundel family were the only Roman Catholics of any prominence who yielded to the ambassador's solicitations.¹

Any one, conversant with the crude notions then obtaining relative to religious toleration and the policy of the Puritan

¹ Bozman, Maryland, vol. II. p. 193.

party, must readily perceive the hopelessness of any such alliance between the Puritans and the Romish party. Nor could the latter make it possible to enter into any permanent agreement with the State, or Anglican, party and secure toleration; for when the Roman Catholics were at the height of their own power, they had utterly failed to put into practice the principles they had demanded when constituting the weaker and persecuted party. They courted favor when they saw it was to their advantage to do so, but never once slackened the rein when it was once in their hands. They could beg and fawn when necessary, but never granted a tithe of that which they asked of others. No wonder they earned the hatred of the reforming parties till their teeth had been all drawn and their bites rendered harmless.

II.

The Anglican party, though possessing all the prestige and authority, all the machinery and power necessary for enacting and enforcing statutes for the repression of recusancy and nonconformity, was, nevertheless, the weakest of all the parties, with a continually waning influence under the persistent attacks of the Puritan party,—the Presbyterians and the Liberty men. The Church of England represented the principle of absolutism in ecclesiastical concerns as did the Stuarts advocate absolutism in the state. Puritanism and despotism, whether in state or in church, were diametrically opposed. The old spirit of intolerance still survived in the modified ritual of the Anglican Church. The sovereign and the primate were their respective main supports. There was little sympathy with the mass of the people.

Supported both by the law and the power, the Anglicans became, in the course of time, a formidable party, and perse-

cuted and martyred with all the venom of the mother church. But, in spite of all such severity and inhumanity towards recusant and nonconformist alike, Puritanism crept through every loophole till it finally was the means of completely honeycombing and overthrowing its power.

The Anglican party attained its culmination under the leadership of Archbishop Laud, when church absolutism and ritual innovations were carried with so high a hand that the whole fabric of both church and state broke down under them and paved the way for the Puritan régime. This extreme policy was carried out to the full in the colony of Virginia, founded during the reign of James I. Here were transplanted all the civil and religious paraphernalia of the mother country; here neither recusant nor nonconformist found a congenial home. The Anglican policy, though exhibited here in miniature, was none the less intolerant. Virginia was one of the few colonies planted in America which can claim an origin unprompted by religious persecution at home, its establishment being due entirely to worldly and selfish motives. If the neighboring province of Maryland was a constant eyesore to Virginia and a thorn in the flesh, the latter showed that she could sting back in more ways than one, thus proving herself the unmistakable offshoot of the ruling policy of the mother land.

When James II. succeeded to the throne and made forcible attempts to carry over the Anglican Church bodily to Rome, the weakness and humiliation of the Anglicans were pitiable in the extreme. Then it happened that Episcopacy was compelled to take shelter under the wing of Puritanism, which tided the Anglican Church over her troubles until by their united forces the two parties had deposed James and set a Protestant monarch on the English throne. This fact

alone proves that loyalty to country was stronger than party issues, when, for the nonce, religious differences could be laid aside in the defense of constitutional liberty. A similar event may be noted in the reign of Elizabeth, at the time when England was threatened with invasion by the great Catholic powers of Christendom, and fears were entertained of the defection of her Roman Catholic subjects,—a possibility on which her enemies had joyfully built their hopes. But when the crisis was to be met, Romanist and Protestant alike flew to arms in the defense of their common liberties. And thus will it ever be, be what the party may or what it proclaims. Religious differences have stood little, if any, in the way of constitutional liberty.

III.

Soon after the separation of England from the Court of Rome, the wave of religious reform reached British shores and brought about changes in ecclesiastical matters, first set in motion by the personal interests of Henry VIII. Although the Papal authority was now overturned in England, a similar authority over the Anglican Church was claimed by Henry and his successors. For this reason the court reformers did not intend to make any more changes in the ecclesiastical polity than were necessary to substitute the temporal ruler of England for the Pope, putting into the hands of the sovereign certain powers which it was claimed had been usurped by Rome. These reformers did not deny the Pope's authority in his capacity of Bishop of Rome, his own diocese; nor did they wish it to be understood that the Roman Church was not Catholic. But they merely pared away certain alleged encroachments and excrescences of the Papacy and retained all the other priestly offices, ceremonies,

ritual, habits, etc., which were neither enjoined nor forbidden in Scripture. Thus, in point of worship, there was but little difference between the Anglican and Romish communions, the only exception being that the English sovereign was now the ecclesiastical head of the Anglican Church.

Reform seemed now accomplished. But these half-way measures did not suit a body of more radical reformers who, from the very outset, did not think that the distance between the reformed religion and the Papacy could be made too wide. The transference to the temporal sovereign of the supreme power in religious concerns altered, in their opinion, the former despotism but in name only; the substance remained the same. Instead of a foreign, they had now placed over themselves a domestic pope as obnoxious as the old. Hence, these reformers demanded more drastic measures of reform. They were for removing all forms and ceremonies, rubrics, rites, habits, ritual,—in fact everything that savored of the old religion, the ancient superstition. They thus far exceeded the Court party in their reform measures.

These radical reformers were the Puritans, a name ever memorable in the history of English constitutional liberty. They first made their appearance in the reign of Edward VI. But during the Marian persecutions they went into hiding in the cities of Germany and Switzerland, where they listened to the preaching of the famous John Knox, one of their number, who, having imbibed the doctrines of John Calvin, had headed the reformation of the Scottish Kirk. The reform had now advanced with rapid strides on the Continent, where some of the princes of the German states were stout upholders of the new doctrines.

When Elizabeth succeeded to the throne, the Puritans flocked to England in vast numbers, hoping to enjoy a greater

toleration under the new queen. Though still in communion with the Anglican Church they, like the Roman Catholics, refused to promise strict conformity or to accept the pompous ritual so dear to the heart of Elizabeth. And they immediately set to work to make the desired changes in the Anglican Church to which they were not willing to subscribe, for which reason they received the name of Puritans.

Having adopted the doctrines of John Calvin, they early began to formulate a mode of belief with great distinctness. They taught that authority in ecclesiastical concerns did not reside in a single head, whether spiritual or temporal, but in an assemblage of persons, such as an assembly or synod,—a spiritual aristocracy or hierarchy. The civil authorities were not to interfere with ecclesiastical matters at all; yet it was the province of the temporal sovereign, says Cartright, one of the spokesmen for the Puritans, “to protect and defend the councils of the clergy, to keep the peace, to see their decrees executed and to punish contemners of them, but to exercise no spiritual jurisdiction.”

Thus it is evident that the only difference between the polity of Prelacy, Papacy, and Puritanism was one in name and degree only. The authority once assumed by pope or prelate for shaping the discipline of the church was now to be placed in the hands of an assembly, made up of a number of individuals and possessing the powers formerly exercised by a single individual. All three forms of discipline, however, were agreed in this, that they claimed equally the right to call upon the secular arm to enforce their respective decrees. The temporal was as yet regarded as the servant of the spiritual power; for, like the Romish and Anglican parties, the Puritans insisted upon a uniformity of belief. Religious tolerance had found as yet no place in their body ecclesiastical,

even though that religious freedom should not be incompatible with the maintenance of the civil peace.

But, in one respect, the Puritans may be considered as taking a step in advance of the two previous parties. For the same reason that this party opposed absolutism in pope or prelate, it opposed absolutism in the king. Stern and unflinching in its adhesion to its religious tenets, Puritanism as jealously safeguarded the principles of civil liberty; so that, whatsoever may have been the shortcomings of the Puritan party in its ideas of religious toleration, the Puritans were the bulwark of English liberties, checking from time to time every extension of the royal prerogative until they had utterly crushed the despotism of the Stuarts and formulated a constitutional government under William and Mary. The political platform of the Puritan party was a pure republicanism, based on parliamentary rule, just as its ecclesiastical system was grounded on an assembly in which both clericals and laymen found equal representation. Representative government had its full expression in Puritanism, which, when transplanted to American shores, gave birth to the first government based on the principles of equal representation.

The political results of Elizabeth's harsh policy in endeavoring to enforce uniformity in religion at all hazards, even in such trivial matters as those relating to vestments, postures, and so on, have generally been lost sight of in her overweening purpose to establish absolutism in the state. Although the Puritans were republicans at heart, they never once denied the supremacy of the sovereign in civil affairs; it was only in religious concerns wherein they demanded freedom of action and freedom of conscience. But, in the short-sighted policy of coercion, then and for long years to come the prevailing one, the Anglican Church gradually

drifted away from its best interests until most of those of its own confession were confined to the royal family, nobility, and the ruling classes. The mass of the people were non-conformist.

The first effect of the Queen's severity was the defection of the Puritans. In spite of their wish to reform the ritual further, the Puritan party still retained its relations with the English Church; and, not until every attempt made in that direction had proved abortive, did it once think of separation. Their clergymen were deprived of their livings and in some instances suffered death. The prisons were full to overflowing with their fellow religionists. Between the years 1562 and 1566, when the Puritans began to break from the Anglican Church and set up one more in harmony with their own way of thinking, hundreds of Nonconformists fled to Scotland, where the kirk had been reformed by John Knox some years before, or went beyond seas. But, despite this thinning of their ranks, a gallant little band of sturdy souls remained to carry on the good fight at home for constitutional liberty.

A second result of Elizabeth's harsh policy was to confirm the Puritans in their nonconformity, and knit their ranks more strongly together, until they became a formidable party, shouldered and carried through successfully a great civil war, and overturned both church and state, which they afterwards reconstructed on more republican principles.

A still further result of her policy was to split the Puritans into various factions, whereby the gap between them and the first reformers grew wider and wider, and cut off all hope of any accommodation between the several parties, some of which wielded as much influence in the state councils as did the old Puritans themselves. The only common ground now

between the Anglicans and Nonconformists was their thorough Protestantism, their equal opposition to papal supremacy. And this fact, however, emphasized by the various conflicting factions, bound the nation together in its hour of trial, and carried the Reformation in England to a successful termination.

It was in the reign of Elizabeth that the Puritans first became known as a political party in contradistinction to their religious bias. Religion and politics were now closely interwoven. To proclaim one's politics was to declare one's religion, and the converse. Other parties now began to attract attention. The Puritans were pitted against the Anglicans, or Church party, with whom, as the Court party, the Roman Catholics in the two following reigns curried favor. For, so long as the Anglicans and Romanists seemed to join hands, the opposition of the Puritans to the government policy was intense; party spirit never ran higher. The Puritans were a thorn in the side to Elizabeth. They criticised the church most severely, compared prelacy to popery, and considered themselves to be the sole repository of the true faith. Among other animadversions, they taught that the Anglican Church had copied too closely the popish ritual. And here there was a grain of truth in what they said. Elizabeth was as fond of pompous rites and ceremonies as was her father Henry, and was as jealous, too, of her position as head of the English Church. So she answered their strictures by enacting more repressive laws against nonconformity.

The increasing power of the Puritans in Parliament was first noticed in 1562. In the second Parliament called that year, the Act of Supremacy was affirmed. At the convocation, which was opened the day after the meeting of this Parliament, the articles subscribed by the Anglican Church,

originally forty-two in number and drawn up in the reign of Edward VI., were amended and reduced to thirty-nine, the present number. At this time the Puritans had influential friends among the Protestant gentry and a majority in the House of Commons. They were not a faction by any means, but made up of the principal landed proprietors, who represented the universal desire to bring about a change in religious as well as in civil affairs. The Church party, on the other hand, which was always weak, constituted the conservative party, while the Roman Catholics, who were excluded from the Commons, would naturally be silent under the circumstances. "This," says Hallam, "contributed with the prevalent tone of popular opinion to throw such a weight into the Puritanical scale in the Commons as it required all the queen's energy to counterbalance." The Country party, however, was defeated.

In 1571, when the same question came up before Parliament for affirmation, and the objectionable clause relative to the imposition of rites and ceremonies by the sovereign was debated, the Puritan opposition was strong enough to prevent an affirmative vote from being taken on this part of the rubric. Perhaps it was for this reason that the penalties were increased for nonconformity in the following year, as the Puritans at that time suffered severely, and many Puritan clergymen were deprived. In consequence, in 1573, another separation took place, when a large body of Nonconformists formed a church of their own. A general separation was debated but not decided on.

But, in the ten years succeeding, such coercive measures were enforced by the crown for securing uniformity, that multitudes of Nonconformists separated from the Anglican communion, occasioning an almost total desertion and giving

rise to a new religious sect, known as the Brownists. This sect refused all communion with the Establishment, denied the truth of its doctrine altogether,—and this after the defection of its founder, Robert Brown himself. The persecutions that year were nearly effectual in stamping out nonconformity. Emigration to Holland of Puritans became general. But, as a whole, the Puritans were disinclined to a separation. They accepted the main principles of Anglicanism, only differing in methods of church government and in the forms and ceremonies which they hoped, by retaining their place in the Establishment, they might in time be able to reform.

For a while Elizabeth had her hands full in disciplining contumacious recusants, in unearthing popish plots and conspiracies against her life and the peace of the realm, and in bringing the offenders to condign punishment. By 1593, having to her mind sufficiently intimidated the Romish party, she began to think it was high time to tighten the reins over the Puritans, which had become of late too lax. That year an Act was passed which bore heavily upon recusant and Puritan alike, and more than one person paid the penalty of his nonconformity with his life. Under this statute every person above the age of sixteen was required, under the penalty of imprisonment, to attend the established church. Multitudes of Puritans and Romanists again fled to the Low Countries, preferring exile to conformity. From this time, for a period of over forty years, dates the emigration of Puritans to the Netherlands, and in subsequent years to New England, one of the direct results of which was the planting of colonies, nursed in the spirit of opposition to state absolutism, and the laying of the corner-stone of the American Revolution.

But, notwithstanding all these violent measures of Eliza-

beth, in spite of fines and imprisonments, exile, deprivations, and, in some instances, the infliction of the death-penalty, the spirit of Puritanism would not die: it only languished to reappear with renewed energy. Hounded from place to place, shut off from communion with the Anglican Church, with their very Christianity called in question, the Puritan party never was stronger nor counted more powerful friends among its adherents than in those troubled days. Although in such desperate straits, this little, sturdy band of reformers were never louder in their cries for reform than when there seemed the least likelihood of such reformation. The Puritans were ever bitter in their denunciations of anything which bore the least resemblance to the hateful popery; for the staunchness of the Puritans, at this time, to an apparently hopeless cause, was truly remarkable. As their ranks became more and more depleted, the remnant still stood shoulder to shoulder without flinching. It was this spirit, which would not down under the most trying and adverse circumstances but rose with every accession of persecution, that saved England to Protestantism, and built up in the New World the American Republic.

The Puritans had flattered themselves, as did the Romish party, that they should receive more favor from James than heretofore. In this hope a petition was presented to the King on his accession, signed by nearly a thousand Puritan clergymen, asking for toleration and, at the same time, suggesting certain reforms which they deemed highly expedient for the welfare of the church. They could not help letting fall a good word for reform for which they had suffered so many years ingloriously to effect. Beyond a few trifling reforms, which he granted, James required them all forthwith to conform unconditionally or suffer the penalty of the law. The inflexible Puritans, as a matter of course, resisted; and three

hundred ministers, who would not obey his orders, were punished by imprisonment and in other ways. But, bad as this treatment of them was, it was nothing compared with the sufferings endured by the recusants, who had also anticipated toleration. The Separatists suffered still worse than the regular Puritans, especially the Brownists already mentioned. After 1606, multitudes of this sect fled to Holland and settled principally in Amsterdam and Leyden and gave rise to the Independents, a party hereafter to be considered.

The persecutions under Bancroft were exceedingly violent. At this time the Puritans were divided by King James into two parties, namely, the State and the Church Puritans. The former opposed the royal prerogative in Parliament, just as the other disfavored ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies. The latter party, though of small weight in the Commons, was, when united with the State, or Patriot party, more numerous than all the other parties put together.

In 1620 the repressive measures passed against nonconformity became still more severe. Heretofore the penal statutes relative to this subject had more to do with the imposition of forms and ceremonies so obnoxious to the Puritan clergymen. Now the very doctrines of the Puritans were made the object of the animadversions of the crown. These sectaries now obtained the name of Doctrinal Puritans, for the reason that they scrupled to acknowledge the sovereign's headship of the church, would not disclaim Calvinism, nor favor popish innovations. Singularly enough, Archbishop Abbot, then the Primate of England, was at the head of this party; but he soon afterwards fell into disgrace, when many Puritans removed to the new plantations in America. The reign of James had now nearly closed. Popery came in with the negotiations concerning the Spanish match.

In reviewing the fortunes of the Puritan party during the rule of James I., we shall everywhere note the increasing strength and influence of that party, together with the bold stand that it ever took to limit the royal prerogative, to defend the liberties of the people, to oppose prelacy as much as popery, and to guard Protestantism in every quarter. It was the Puritan party which, in 1620, demanded in Parliament that England should espouse the cause of the continental Protestants in their life-and-death struggle with Spain for liberty of conscience, weaken Romish influence at home, as much as possible, by executing more vigorously the statutes for disciplining recusants, and that James should marry his son Charles to a Protestant woman.

The aversion of James to the Puritans seems to have been due to their open avowal of civil liberty and their pronounced hostility to absolute monarchy, rather than to their reforming tendencies in religious concerns. James was exceedingly jealous in maintaining his prerogative, perhaps more so than Elizabeth had ever been. But in striking at the church, the Puritans struck at the crown; and that was an unpardonable offense.

When his son Charles came to the throne, both Roman Catholics and Puritans were promised toleration and the removal of their disabilities; but the King had already assured Parliament that the laws in regard to recusancy should be enforced. The majority of the Lower House was then composed of zealous Calvinists, who loudly demanded the execution of these recusant statutes. Charles, as has elsewhere been shown, was a Romanist at heart, and connived at every infringement of these laws, although he ostensibly followed their letter. During his whole reign the Church and Romish parties were to all appearances united. Under

the administration of Laud almost popish innovations were introduced into the Anglican service, which served but to rouse greater hostility from the Puritans. Protestantism seemed well nigh to be a lost cause in England, with the Papacy again in the ascendant.

For their continual and growing unwillingness to conform to the new ecclesiastical system, and, at the same time, their persistence in attempting to reform the church from within, the Puritans, as usual, paid the penalty of their temerity. The drastic measures, now adopted to bring about uniformity, "gave birth," says Neal, "to a second colony in North America, commonly known by the name of Massachusetts Bay." In 1629, John Winthrop, at the head of a thousand Puritans, set sail for New England. Others followed up to 1635. "It has been computed," observes the author above quoted, "that the four settlements of New England, viz., Plymouth, the Massachusetts Bay, Connecticut, and New Haven, all of which was accomplished before the beginning of the Civil Wars, drained England of four or five hundred thousand pounds in money (a very large sum for those days); and if the persecution of the Puritans had continued twelve years longer, it is thought that a fourth part of the riches of the kingdom would have passed out of it through this channel."

All the emigrants, except those who settled in Plymouth, were distinctively Puritans; while those who planted that colony came from England by the way of Holland, and have been denominated Pilgrims in contradistinction to the other Puritans whose doctrines had not become so adulterated by a sojourn in the Low Countries. According to Neal, down to 1640 as many as seventy-seven Puritan clergymen, who subsequently were pastors of the various churches and congrega-

tions in New England, held orders in the Anglican Church. This fact will explain much in reference to the Puritanical hierarchy in New England, especially in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay.

But, if paralyzed, the Puritan cause in England was not crushed. With every fresh persecution and consequent losses by emigration of its members, the party received new life. In their exasperation of everything which bore the least resemblance to popery, the Puritans kept up the good fight for the Protestant cause and civil liberty, and gained rather than lost in popular favor. Their influence continued to extend in spite of any attempt to weaken them. Parliament was now wholly Puritan; and from the outbreak of the civil wars up to the Restoration, Puritanism under the Presbyterians became the established religion.

It was in 1644, when England was under Parliamentary rule, that Roger Williams, the founder of the Colony of Providence Plantations, obtained his first charter. It was during the Commonwealth and the Protectorate that Anglican and Romanist alike paid court to the Puritan party, and with the same once persecuted party Lord Baltimore carried favor, and so preserved through that troubled period his Palatinate of Maryland.

But, when the Puritans became in turn the ruling party, they, too, had failed to learn the lesson of toleration. As in their former struggles for principles, so, in their hour of triumph, they did not lay aside their hostility to Romanists and to all others who dissented from themselves; and so, too, on coming into power, the Presbyterians were not averse to doing a little persecution on their own account. There was no place in the doctrine of Calvin for religious tolerance. The old Puritans never denied the Anglican Church its right to

persecute and enforce uniformity; they only wanted their own form of belief to be given amnesty. They were now as eager to make others conform and as much opposed to "lawless toleration" as ever was the most bigoted Roman Catholic or rigidest Churchman. Laud himself could not have surpassed them in this respect. But, fortunately, Cromwell would have none of it; and it was left for their co-religionists in the New World to give free rein to their lawless intolerance. Though opposed to some of the religious sectaries, Cromwell never advocated coercion.

Charles II. had made many promises of toleration on his restoration, and thus gave great hopes to the various classes of Dissenters, as Nonconformists now begin to be termed, of security. Religious toleration seemed to be the fashion. But the Stuarts were never distinguished for their sincerity; and the old laws concerning nonconformity were dragged forth and more or less rigorously executed. Charles played a double game. Though pledged to grant tolerance to the Roman Catholics, he still desired to satisfy the more rabid Puritans. But, despite his many vacillations, he really did seem desirous to reconcile the Anglicans and Presbyterians, to whom he had been indebted for the restoration of the crown.

The Puritan influence now began to ebb until the following reign, when it gained new life by setting William and Mary on the English throne, establishing a constitutional monarchy, puritanizing the Anglican Church, and, above all, proving its right to existence. England was at last thoroughly protestantized, with no fears of its backsliding.

It was in the reign of the second Charles (1663) when he was courting the favor of all parties, that Roger Williams secured his second charter for his plantations through the influence of the Earl of Warwick. This patent gave "full

liberty of conscience in matters of religion"; though the colonists had no intention of conforming "to the public exercise of religion according to the liturgy of the Church of England."

In the charter, granted the proprietors of Carolina the same year as that of Roger Williams, it is there explicitly stated (Sect. 18) that all persons shall enjoy liberty of conscience, provided they show "all fidelity, loyalty, and obedience to the king," and "do not actually disturb the civil peace." Furthermore, no person was to suffer molestation on account of his private religious belief. In 1665, the terms of this charter were somewhere extended. Hence, religious freedom had at last found an abiding place in the New World among chartered rights.

Just previous to the outbreak of the Civil Wars, all authority being now in the hands of the Commons, Parliament set about making a reform in religion, and called together for that purpose, as was the custom, an assembly of divines. The complexion of Parliament at this time was Presbyterian, or Calvinistic; so was the proposed Assembly. There were still individuals among the old Puritans in orders; but these were soon identified with the Presbyterians, as has already been adduced. The old name now disappears to reappear under that of Dissenter.

No radical measures were contemplated at first by Parliament in making this reform,—nothing more, in fact, but a sort of modified Episcopacy. But, after their union with the Scotch Presbyterians, the "Puritans," says Neal, "did not fight for a reformation of the hierarchy, nor for the generous principle of religious liberty to all peaceable subjects, but for the same spiritual power the bishops had exercised; for when they had got rid of the oppression of the spiritual courts,

under which they had groaned for almost fourscore years, they were for setting up a number of Presbyterian consistories and parishes of England, equally burdensome and oppressive."

The old Puritans were now divided into three factions, strong both in the Assembly and the Commons. These were the Presbyterians, already cited; the Erastians; the Independents. The Anglican party had lost about all the influence it had ever enjoyed in Parliament, and may be counted out, as it did not now have there a single representative. All the energies of the Presbyterian party were now concentrated on the establishment of the "divine right of Presbytery" and of a Presbyterian form of ecclesiasticism. This "power of the keys," as it was called, found no friends among either of the other two factions, both of whom were the sworn foes of every sort of ecclesiastical usurpation. And if the united forces of these two parties did not succeed in defeating the obnoxious measure entirely, they had much to do in hindering the Presbyterian hierarchy from resorting to extreme methods in carrying out its discipline. And yet the old Puritanic spirit was strong enough to prevent the doctrine of religious toleration from being accomplished. This work was left for the other two parties, now to be considered, whose history is so intimately connected with that of the Puritans as to form the sequel of that party.

IV.

The more powerful of the two parties now to be considered, and the one which resisted longest the pretensions of the Presbyterians, were the Erastians. In religion they were what is known as Separatists; but they had little in common with the old Puritan party from which they had separated. In politics they advocated everywhere the supremacy of the king.

The Erastian doctrine began to prevail in England in 1588, and spread with wonderful rapidity. The party took its name from Erastus, a German divine, born in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. He preached principles diametrically opposed to spiritual, or ecclesiastical, supremacy, as had once been exhibited in Popery, Prelacy, and now in Presbyterianism, or Presbytery. The Erastians held that the civil magistrate alone had authority to punish all offenses whether of a religious or a civil nature. This scheme of ecclesiastical polity had the advantage, it was thought, of preventing the establishment of a government within a government (*imperium in imperio*), and thereby averting the abuses from which none of the other religious sectaries had been exempt. The pastoral office was entirely persuasive; no coercive measures were admissible in maintaining ecclesiastical discipline.

When not pressed too far, Erastianism was an effectual corrective of the assumptions of the three other forms of hierarchy already adduced. The religious teaching of these sectaries, according to Neal, "effectually destroyed all that spiritual jurisdiction and coercive power over the consciences of men, which had been challenged by popes, prelates, and presbyteries; and they made the government of the Church a creature of the State." It was still further maintained by them that Scripture prescribed "no one form of church government as an invariable rule for future ages." In this respect they were somewhat in consonance with the Independents.

The Erastian doctrine was not new, it having previously appeared under another name. All the early reformers entertained the same sentiments and were for resigning to the crown everything relating to the liberty of the conscience. Hence Erastianism was nothing more than a revival of the old Anglican doctrine of royal supremacy, but now softened by

time and reappearing in a modified form.

The Anglican Church first assumed the functions of judge in ecclesiastical matters under Archbishop Whitgift, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. It claimed the right of punishing heresy and contumacy as much as popery had ever done. Under Whitgift's administration, the measures adopted for disciplining offenders were even at that time considered somewhat of a stretch of power. But under Bancroft the hierarchy went to yet greater lengths, when was boldly asserted the doctrine of the "divine right of Episcopacy," together with the authority of coercing Nonconformists, as the persecutions of the Puritans at that period fully attest. It was the constant desire and aim of the bishops to render the jurisdiction of the Anglican Church as unlimited as possible, and wholly independent of the law courts, in which, from the time of Henry II., was lodged the power to restrain the spiritual courts in case they should venture to overstep their proper limits. Bancroft made the first attempt in this direction in 1605, which not only completely failed, but drew upon the Episcopacy the hostility of the secular lawyers, who had always been jealous of these ecclesiastical judicatures; nor did the latter win the favor of the judges.

To purge the Church of the odium of the Puritan persecutions, the bishops transferred all cases of nonconformity from the Court of High Commission to the Assizes, to be tried at common law. The temporal power was thus made to execute the commissions of the ecclesiastical officers. Under Laud the hierarchy laid claim to an authority and to privileges on a par with the royal prerogative itself for which it had not the least legality, and which in the end proved its own destruction. The contest that had been waged so long between Anglicanism

and Puritanism closed with the utter discomfiture of the former.

Now just as Episcopacy had hoped to secure, by the use of coercion, uniformity of belief, and found in the Puritan party an opponent equally as zealous in attaining its aim, so, to the growing power of Calvinism in a similar direction, was the Erastian doctrine destined to be an effectual counteractive by its emphasis of the old-time dictum of the royal prerogative. If any one should govern, said this party, it should be the civil magistrate; the "keys" should not by any means be placed in the hands of the English Church. In their hostility to every kind of ecclesiastical supremacy, the Erastians found willing and powerful coadjutors in the Independent party.

The Erastians were largely recruited from the ranks of the civil lawyers, no friends to ecclesiastical usurpations. This party numbered among its adherents Dr. Lightfoot, one of the most celebrated theologians of the day, and was headed by Seldon, a lawyer of no mean acquirements. Half the House was Erastian, all of whom denied emphatically the divine right of the church. And, furthermore, the liberality of belief, which this party advocated, drew to it all broad-minded persons. It never was for employing coercive measures in securing uniformity of religion. According to their teachings, the gospel was a free gift to all who would accept it; every one was welcome to drink of the fount; none to be coerced. Herein certainly lay, in theory at least, the germs of religious liberty.

In politics their platform was in harmony with popular feeling. This remained true down to comparatively recent times. For, according to Hallam, who wrote in the middle of the last century, "the ecclesiastical constitution of England is nearly Erastian in theory and almost wholly so in practice.

Every sentence of the spiritual judge is liable to be reversed by a civil tribunal."

In 1645 the Presbyterians accused Parliament of being Erastian because it would not surrender to them the spiritual authority to which it held fast. For, it must be remembered, that Parliament passed ordinances at this time, regulating the discipline of the Establishment and prescribing the form of belief and the modes of suspension from its communion. Hence, though never professing to intermeddle with spiritual concerns proper, Parliament retained its claim to punish errors and misdemeanors within the Church. But the authority for determining such cases was now transferred from a single head to an assembly, or synod, where each question was determined by the vote of the majority of the members present. This method of trying such cases was of course due to the change in the form of government, at this time republican. And, if Parliament had given the several presbyteries absolute control over all their communicants, it had, nevertheless, reserved to itself the right of the last appeal, the demand made by the Presbyterians for themselves.

V.

The Independents as a political party first came into notice about the year 1640. From their very organization they made a bold stand against the High Presbyterian, now the High Church, party. Perhaps at this date they did not exceed a dozen in the Westminster Assembly of Divines; but they rapidly rose into prominence and, down to the Restoration, successfully checked the pretensions of the Presbyterian hierarchy.

During the persecution of the Puritans, under Whitgift, and later under Bancroft, multitudes of this persecuted sect were

driven from the Anglican Church, forced into exile and separation. From this time dates the great subdivision of this party into a variety of sectaries. Among them were the Brownists, who, in their hostility to the Church of England, professed doctrines the farthest yet removed from that communion.

The Brownists took their name from one Robert Brown, a Puritan of extensive learning, and arose in the year 1580. During the persecutions of 1583, under Whitgift, the Brownists, in company with a large number of other Puritans, sought shelter in Holland, where, in the town of Middleburg, they founded a church of their peculiar belief. This was dissolved in 1589, through the defection of Brown himself, who returned to England and made his peace with the Establishment. But the seeds sown by this sect in England had not fallen on stony ground; nor did the desertion of their founder have any disheartening effect upon his followers, for a Brownist congregation was soon afterward established in London.

In the persecution of the Puritans, in 1604, under Bancroft, and subsequently, Holland was again made the asylum of the persecuted. Two years later, a number of Brownists, with John Robinson at their head, emigrated to Amsterdam, and thence to Leyden, and formed a church, where Mr. Robinson softened the harsh doctrines of Brown and became the founder of what was known as Independency. Soon after, one Henry Jacob, a Puritan, influenced by the preaching of Robinson, became an Independent, and, in 1616, introduced Independency into England by founding a congregation of that form of belief in London. This was the origin of Independency, or Congregationalism, in England.

The Leyden church emigrated to America in 1630, and,

under Brewster, planted the colony of New Plymouth, thus establishing the very first congregation of Independents in America. From this church sprang modern Congregationalism.

In England the Brownists at length became identified with the Independents, the extremists of which party in all probability belonged to the parent denomination. One of the early clergymen (or ministers as this sect now began to name their pastors) of the Independents was Samuel Howe, who died in prison, on account of his doctrines, in 1636. This minister is interesting to us Americans from the fact that Roger Williams has spoken of him in high terms, as being a very pious and godly man. He was born in humble life and possessed little or no education. The Brownists did not consider a liberal education of any importance to a preacher; nor did the Independents discourage lay preaching, were the candidates for orders possessed of the proper spiritual disposition. The Plymouth colony was slow in laying any stress upon education; the commonwealth of Rhode Island never did so until long after it had ceased to be an English colony.¹ On the other hand, the Puritans were strong advocates of education, especially of an educated ministry.

The influence of this Howe is clearly seen in the teachings and writings of Williams; and perhaps it is not too much to say, that Williams drew his ideas of "soul liberty" from the Brownist doctrines as taught by Samuel Howe.

In the times of which we are writing, religion and politics were so closely interwoven that it becomes extremely difficult to dissociate the two. As every circumstance in life was tinged with religion, politics would naturally not escape its coloring. And this religious coloring was never more ap-

¹ Staples, *Annals of Providence*, p. 492.

parent than when found in the ecclesiastico-political party known as the Independents; for this party was distinctively recognized as the party of toleration.

The two broad, vital principles put forth by Robert Brown in his scheme of church polity, and handed down to his successors, were: 1. *The absolute independence of the church of all civil or spiritual headship in matters of discipline*, whereby either one was empowered to use coercive measures; but that all authority to regulate its own concerns should be lodged in each of the several congregations of which that denomination was composed; 2. *The principle of toleration in its broadest sense*. The first principle emphasized a democratic form of government in ecclesiastical matters, a modification of the Presbyterian synod, or assembly; the second *proclaimed, for the first time in the history of the world, the doctrine of the absolute separation of church and state*—the grand principle which forms one of the corner-stones of the Republic of the United States.

In their plea for separation the Brownists declared they would have no communion with any religious organization which did not fulfill the requirements of their doctrines. In this category were of course placed all papists, prelates, and presbyteries.¹ In politics they carried matters with a high hand,

¹ This fact explains the language of Cotton Mather (*Magnalia Christi Americana*, fol. Ed., bk. vii. chap. ii., p. 7) when he says that Williams would have no dealings with "the Church of Boston because they would not make a public and solemn declaration of repentance for their communicating with the Church of England." He elsewhere calls Williams a Separatist and a Seeker, and speaks of him as advocating the principle that "every one should have liberty to worship God according to the light of his own conscience; and owning to no true churches or ordinances now in the world." Barring sectarian bitterness, this passage proves, beyond question, that Williams was an extreme or ultra Brownist. He finally repudiated church government altogether, and would worship wherever and however he pleased.

even bordering on revolution, and, during the Civil Wars, constituted the fanatical wing of the Independent faction. Thus, from 1581 to 1583, Robert Brown and the early leaders of the Separatists taught that the magistrates "may do nothing concerning the Church but only civilly,"¹ and as civil magistrates; that is, they have not that authority over the church as to be prophets, or priests, or spiritual kings, as they are magistrates over the same, but only "to rule the Commonwealth in all outward justice, to maintain the right, welfare, and honor thereof, with outward power, bodily punishment, and civil forcing of men." Brown further maintained that the state had nothing whatever to do with matters of religion; a church was to be ruled by its own members.

In 1609, Henry Jacob, the founder of the first Independent congregation in England, addressed King James in "An Humble Supplication for Toleration," wherein he prayed that every church might be free to practise its own religion, "elect, ordain, and depose her own ministers, and to exercise all the other points of lawful ecclesiastical jurisdiction under Christ."

Another forward step in the toleration movement was made in 1614 by one Leonard Bücher, an English Baptist, once a Brownist, who at that time published a work entitled "Religious Peace, or a Plea for Liberty of Conscience." He taught a religious freedom that is unequaled at the present day. He would have toleration extended to every heresy and to every religion, be what it might, Christian or otherwise;

¹These Brownistic principles may be still further exemplified in the compact purported to be signed by Roger Williams and by all others who had intended to become inhabitants of Providence Plantations, wherein they agreed to submit "only in civil things" (Early Records of Providence, vol. 1. p. 9).

neither would he have irreligious persons punished for their unbelief.

Such were the main points of Brownism as enunciated by its founder and his more immediate successors, which gave rise to Independency, in England through Jacob, in America through Brewster. The doctrine of independency formed a middle ground between Brownism and Presbyterianism, steering clear of the fanaticism and extravagances of the one and the bigotry and strait-lacedness of the other. But, in common with all the other reformed religions, it maintained its hostility to the Church of Rome. However, it was the moderate Independents who preserved this middle course throughout its brief reign under Parliament and Cromwell. Even Hume, a writer who appears to have associated with this party all the excesses and revolutionary tendencies displayed by the various sectaries who had sheltered themselves under the wing of the Independents, speaks in warm praise of this party as a whole. "Of all the Christian sects," says he, "this was the first which during its prosperity as well as its adversity always adopted the principle of toleration; and it is remarkable that so remarkable a doctrine owed its origin not to reasoning, but to the height of extravagance and fanaticism."¹

Perhaps a better comprehension of the religious and political principles of the Independents may be gained, so far as it fits the scope of this article, by considering them in their relation with the Westminster Assembly of Divines, with Parliament, and with the Army under Cromwell. In the last two in-

¹ According to Neal, in 1645, there were as many as sixteen different religious sectaries in England. The Independents head the list because they were for tolerating all others who agreed with them in the fundamentals of Christianity, and originated all the other sects. Among these may be cited the Brownists, Separatists, Antinomians, Anabaptists, Arminians, Seekers, Sceptics, Socinians, Arlans, etc. According to Baxter, the Parliamentary Army was half Presbyterian.

stances we shall not fail to notice a blending of religion with politics which constitute these sectaries a true, ecclesiastico-political party.

In the year 1643, Parliament summoned the Assembly of Divines to consider the regulation of the spiritual concerns of the Commonwealth. At this session the Anglican party, though summoned with the rest, either ignored the summons or constituted so small a factor in the consultation as to count for nothing. As a fact the Anglican Church had ceased to be the Establishment. The Independents were a small force, but backed by Goodwin, the chaplain of Cromwell himself, by Nye, and other influential persons. The Erastians joined forces with the Independents, and were instrumental in checking the arrogance of the Presbyterians in more than one instance. There was also present a sprinkling of Anabaptists, or Baptists, and a few other sectaries.

The debate opened with the presentation of the subject of the ordination of clergymen and the authority of such ordination. The Presbyterians, as had been expected, proposed that their presbytery should be the source whence all such ordination should proceed. This proposition was opposed by both Erastians and Independents, the latter on the grounds that each separate congregation should elect its own officers. For, they argued, that, in the ordination of ministers, nothing should be done which should be the means of conveying "office-power" to clergymen irrespectively of their congregations, or to ministers who had no congregations of their own, *for fear a minister might be given undue spiritual power which resided only in and through each separate congregation.*

The debate upon this question alone lasted for ten days. The force of circumstances, however, obliged the Independents at this juncture to withdraw their motion and acquiesce

in the Presbyterian practice, "provided it was attended with an open declaration that was not intended as a conveyance of office-power,"—a saving clause indeed.

The next subject brought up to be considered by the Assembly was as to whether the church should be regarded as a divine institution. This, of course, was denied by none, the only difference of opinion being in the fact as to which form of belief belonged the "divine right." The Erastians proposed that the sole "power of the keys" should rest with the civil magistrate, or, at least, that it be so agreed until the affairs of the nation became more settled. For they denied this divine right not only to the Assembly, but to the pulpit, as they feared that Presbytery might become as arbitrary and tyrannical as Prelacy had formerly been, were its claim to divine authority allowed. The Erastians did not, however, oppose the Presbyterians on political grounds. The Independents also had a scheme of their own to propose. So each party claimed for itself the power of the keys.

The question was at length carried in favor of the Presbyterians. But, as it was to be brought up again before Parliament for confirmation, the Erastian party reserved all their strength for that occasion when, with the coöperation of the Independent vote, they hoped to overthrow the Presbyterians. At this juncture, the two parties just mentioned, finding that they could not carry their own measures, agreed upon a compromise and combined their forces against the common enemy. In this they were entirely successful, defeating the Presbyterian party at every point, and carrying in concurrence the proposition "that it is lawful and agreeable to God that the Church be governed by congregational, classical, and synodical assemblies." Thus were the Presbyterians completely out-generated.

Not to be thus baffled, the Presbyterians carried their grievance to the House of Lords in the hope that the sentence of the Commons might there be reversed, and praying "for a speedy settlement of Church government according to the Covenant, and that no toleration might be given to popery, prelacy, superstition, heresy, profaneness, or anything contrary to sound doctrine, and that *all private assemblies might be restrained.*" In their reply, the Lords promised that so much zeal thus displayed in the cause of religion should not go unrewarded, and therefore recommended the city magistrates (London) to repress all unlawful assemblies. But the Commons remained unshaken; while this interference proved ruinous to the Presbyterian cause.

The next subject of debate was the "power of the keys." This question was undecided in the Assembly, but carried to the House of Commons, where it was easy to see how it would be treated. The Independents fought it partly on toleration and partly on doctrinal lines; the Erastians wholly on political grounds. The former desired all religious affairs to be referred to their proper religious authorities, without any interference of the civil arm. The latter were for a free and open communion, and against all suspensions and excommunications, and referred all crimes and misdemeanors to the civil magistrate. Both, however, seemed to agree to toleration in religion and to no compulsory uniformity.

The aim of the Presbyterians, on the other hand, was to establish a hierarchy like both of those which had been overthrown; and it was patent to every one that they demanded a church which should be entirely independent of the state. In this attempt Parliament was determined to disappoint them. Although the two Houses had made Presbyterianism the state religion, they had reserved to themselves the right of

appeal as a last resort in all cases of ecclesiastical discipline, not only retaining in their own hands the spiritual sword, but effectually checking every effort of the Presbyterian hierarchy to enforce the penal laws against nonconformity from their standpoint, which would make all religious denominations not agreeing with them nonconformist.

But "nobody," says Neal, "was pleased; the Episcopalians and Independents were excluded; and because the Parliament would not give the several Presbyteries an absolute power over their communicants, but reserved the last appeal to themselves, neither the Scotch nor the English Presbyterians would accept it." The Independents, accordingly, petitioned both Houses to reconsider their case and grant them toleration, using arguments to show that they did not disagree with the general doctrines accepted by the Presbyterian party. But the leading Presbyterians, who had the preponderance of power in both bodies, would consent to nothing unless to an unconditional surrender; to which the Rev. Mr. Burroughs, whom Baxter even regarded with admiration, spoke the sentiments of Independency when he said: "If their congregations might not be exempted from that coercive power of the classes; if they might not have liberty to govern themselves in their own way, so long as they behave peaceably towards the civil magistrate, they were resolved to suffer, or go to some other place of the world, where they might enjoy their liberty. But while men think there is no way of peace but by forcing all to be of the same mind; while they think the civil sword is an ordinance of God to determine all controversies of divinity, and that it must needs be attended with fines and imprisonment to the disobedient; while they apprehend there is no medium between a strict conformity and a general confusion of things; while these sentiments prevail,

there must be a base subjection of men's consciences to slavery, a suppression of much truth, and great disturbances in the Christian world."

If the Independents fared thus badly at the hands of the Presbyterians, they received still worse treatment from the Scotch Kirk. The Scotch were loud in their denunciations of that sect. The Kirk Presbyterians opposed any and every doctrine not in harmony with the Covenant; declared against the toleration of the other religious sectaries and liberty of conscience which, they considered, would open the door to licentiousness and utterly destroy the true religion. Sermons were preached against the Independents from Scottish pulpits; pamphlets flung broadcast both in favor of and against toleration. But, if the Independents and Anabaptists had lost the day in the Assembly, where they no longer had representation, the Presbytery was powerless to molest them.

If not in the Assembly, their party had representatives in Parliament. In 1644, these were Lords Say and Wharton and the younger Vane, Sir Harry, who was the friend of Roger Williams and of Oliver Cromwell, then the acknowledged leader of the House of Commons. There were two events that year which more than anything else indicated the growing power of the party. First, a bill had been introduced into Parliament to deprive those who had seats in the Commons of any office of trust they held at the same time. This was carried as a political measure and known as the "Self-denying Ordinance." The passage of this bill would exclude the Lord Protector himself from the House. But, by a course of intrigue, or "lobbying," the case of Cromwell was excepted. This ordinance, says Hallam, "which took from all members of both Houses their commands in the army, or civil employments, was, as is well known, the first great victory of the

Independent party which had lately grown up under Vane and Cromwell."

The second event was of a religious complexion and related to toleration. The question had been brought up in Parliament in reference to the toleration of Independents and other sectaries. Cromwell, then a member of the House, proposed that, in all the schemes suggested for establishing any form of church government, "tender consciences should be taken into consideration." This "Accommodation Order," as it was designated, was accepted by the Commons without a division and Cromwell himself, in addition, given a vote of thanks for his proposition.

In 1647 the Independent party was split into two factions. One was for using temporizing means in setting up the old monarchical system of government; the other for more radical measures. The first constituted the old, moderate, conservative party, composed of men like Vane, St. John Fiennes, and others. The second was known under the name of Republicans, and it comprehended the Levelers, Ranters, Fifth Monarchy Men, rabid Anabaptists and Antinomians; in religion, noisy, iconoclastic, who would overturn church and religion itself, and bring nobles and everybody else to the same level with themselves, and only establishing their claim to Independent parentage by their avowal of the most extreme license;—in politics as subversive as in religion, desirous of any change; would now destroy monarchy and king together; now opposed to all order and government;—all which but indicated their anarchistic tendencies. They not only lost the regard of the reputable element in the community, but they threw discredit upon the very party to which they owed their origin.

After the administration of "Pride's Purge" to Parliament

and when the younger Sir Henry Vane and all the moderate Independents had been excluded from the Commons or imprisoned, and the army ruled in both church and state, then it was that these two factions sought the ranks of the army, one for protection, and the other to further its more radical views; and these last served but to awaken the disgust of the Episcopacy, the Presbyterians, and all peace-loving citizens alike, who now entered into a compact from which the better class of Independents, unfortunately, was excluded. On account of the leveling bent of the Republicans, the Lords sided with the Presbyterians; for, as the two factions were agreed in their ideas of religious toleration, they were placed in the same category, even though the conservative Independents had never shown any animosity either towards the monarchy or towards a mild form of Episcopacy, provided toleration should find a place in the church government. But the intemperance of the other sectaries left them no other alternative but to turn to the military, which, at that time, was governed by a violent faction, never satisfied until they had accomplished the ruin of the existing government. And, if Cromwell employed these incendiaries for the accomplishment of his purposes, he was never in sympathy with their extravagances, but ever held them in check, though in his political course he seems to have been guided by the revolutionary party.

It is to be regretted, that, in their advocacy of religious and political freedom, the Independent party did not have broader and more definite ideas of the principles which they so energetically advocated. They were willing to include in their toleration the more sober-minded Anabaptists, or Baptists; but Papists, and all sectaries who did not agree with them in the fundamentals of Christianity, they had no inclination to

admit into their freehold. And, though rather misty in defining their scheme of religious toleration, yet it must be admitted on all sides that the Independents were the first party, or religious organization, which, both in its teaching and practice, enunciated the doctrine of soul liberty. As recent a writer as Gardiner, in his "History of the Civil Wars," has remarked, that, for this teaching of the Independents (the principles of democratic government and of religious toleration), posterity owes them a deep debt of gratitude.

Cromwell was himself an Independent in religion and always sided with the professors of that creed. But, if he was in favor of toleration, he did not think it should be carried to such a length as would be injurious to the public peace, that is license. Nor did he consider any particular doctrine should be proscribed because it seemed ridiculous to the educated classes. We have already seen where his sympathies lay when he proposed his "Accommodation Order."

That religious toleration first began to be formulated in the first half of the seventeenth century must now be evident to all. The movement owed its greatest impulse to the influence of Oliver Cromwell. In 1645, Governor Sayle, formerly of the Bermudas, and another delegate, petitioned the House of Commons to grant religious toleration to all persons who had left the Anglican communion and to permit them to organize congregations of their own. The House gave the desired protection to both public and private church organizations, and furthermore moved, "That the inhabitants of the Summer Islands [Bermudas] and such others as shall join themselves to them, without any molestation or trouble, shall have and enjoy the liberty of conscience in matters of God's worship, as well as in those parts of America where they are now planted, as in other parts of America where hereafter they may plant."

In the passage of this ordinance one may readily perceive the hand of the younger Vane, if not also that of Cromwell, who was then all-powerful in the Commons. It was in this year that Roger Williams published, in England, his celebrated treatise on religious liberty, wherein he arraigns those who have persecuted others on account of their religious tenets. And, in 1650, Cromwell, much to the disgust of the Presbyterian party, repealed the penal statutes which had been enacted in previous years against nonconformity, and only made it obligatory for all persons to keep Sundays and Fast days, both publicly and privately, in a religious and seemly manner. From 1647 to 1659, then, while England was under the Protectorate, almost universal toleration prevailed.

At the Restoration, Independency found no place among the political questions of the day. Cavaliers and Roundheads had entered into a combination to restore Charles to the throne of his fathers; and they were the sole parties to be considered under the new régime. But, in 1660, the Independents and Anabaptists presented a bill to the King, praying him to grant toleration to religions of all shades, so as to secure peace and quiet to the nation. The Roman Catholics were evidently included in this memorial; and some concessions were likewise made to the Presbyterians. But nothing came of it.

But, in 1672, some sort of toleration was patched up. Dissenters and Nonconformists were included in this religious amnesty and permitted to assemble in certain places for public worship; while the Papists, or recusants, were not to be molested so long as they confined their religious exercises to private houses, removed from general observation. But even this settlement of so perplexing a question did not suit the more rabid Roundheads, as the Puritans were now denominated, who complained that the Roman Catholics had

been granted a greater indulgence than themselves. They most likely made these complaints for the reason that they had been disappointed in the larger hopes held out to them by Charles on his restoration.

By a statute, known as the "Act of Toleration," passed on the accession of William and Mary, a somewhat limited form of toleration was extended to all classes of dissenters and non-conformists except papists. But, if the latter were not mentioned by name in this general amnesty, recusants were at no time disturbed in the full enjoyment of their form of worship.

The good seed, however, had not fallen upon stony ground. All the sufferings in the cause of religious liberty had not been for nothing. From that time forth not a single person has suffered bodily harm in England because of his religious belief. As the wave of humanity and soul liberty began to spread over the civilized world, the ridiculousness, not to speak of the savagery, of forcing persons to accept doctrines in which they could not believe, was clearly seen. As time went on, political disabilities on account of religion were also gradually removed. Coercion had constantly added enemies to the English constitution; for religious persecution indicates nothing else than a dread of a rival sect by the persecuting party or a fear that its true weakness will be seen, or its tenets too closely examined. As a fact, persecution but lent strength to the persecuted.

The study of these ecclesiastico-political parties leads one to the unavoidable conclusion, that to their mutual conflicts was due the first glimmering of religious liberty. In all these contests, however, two broad principles were clearly and indisputably established, namely, the right of each and every

religious sect to exist, and, in case of its attainment of the requisite power, the privilege of coercing the weaker party. But the outcome of this struggle for supremacy produced only a drawn game, a political rather than a religious toleration,—the last and the least expected result of all this interclashing. A supposed conflict of interests ended in a cessation of arms, not from conviction but from sheer exhaustion. The cornerstone, therefore, of religious toleration was not laid amid universal festivity, the ringing of bells, bonfires, and salvos of artillery, but amid the most violent contentions of opposing parties.

ARTICLE IV. .

UNIVERSITIES AND SOCIAL ADVANCE.

BY THE REVEREND A. A. BERLE, D.D., SALEM, MASS.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM JAMES, addressing the Association of American Alumnae at Radcliffe College in 1907, near the close of his address made use of these words :—

"It would be a pity if any future historian were to have to write words like these: 'By the middle of the twentieth century the higher institutions of learning had lost all influence over public opinion in the United States. But the mission of raising the tone of democracy which they had proved themselves so lamentably unfitted to exert, was assumed with rare enthusiasm and prosecuted with extraordinary skill and success by a new educational power, and for the clarification of their human sympathies and elevation of their human preferences the people at large acquired the habit of resorting exclusively to the guidance of certain private literary adventures, commonly designated in the market by the affectionate name of ten-cent magazines.'"

If almost anybody but the most gifted man who has inhabited the college precincts of Cambridge for many years had made this speech, there would have been a contemptuous shrugging of shoulders on the part of the illuminati who reside there and thereabouts, implying another appeal to the galleries. And some did actually thus shrug their cultivated shoulders and sniff that anything or anybody could or should destroy their influence. But William James has in these many years created so large and powerful an influence and following that recent utterances of the apostle of a superior class¹ seem like a belated survival of another age

¹For a classic example of the mixture of the trifling and social ignorance and dilettantism which is rendering "university" opinion accursed to the thoughtful people of New England, see Professor Wendell's "Privileged Classes," Boston Transcript, February 5. The address was given at Chicago.

beside the sane and human utterances of the psychologist who has discovered and dared to proclaim that humanity has a soul and a heart as well as a head. But Professor James's utterance is itself a trifle late, and the historian of to-day, while not able to say just what this conjectural future historian might say, is able to affirm that the premier influence in the American mind is no longer that which springs from the universities and colleges, in spite of the enormous increase of their endowments and students. He is able to say that in the last fifteen years no single cherished American institution has lost much more in the public esteem than the university. He is able to say, that a distinct and growing chasm exists between the public mind and the university habit of mental approach which is sure to have lasting and determinate results in the development of American character and the democratization of American education; that sooner or later there will be a revolution of opinion on the subject of university education; and that the facts which are now uppermost and regnant in the public mind, and which are demanding the rigid application of democratic standards of judgment and approach to every other institution and practice, will also finally require that the university shall conform.

There is no idea which has had larger force with the American public in the past century than the idea of the value and power of education. The worship of the public school has amounted almost to fetichism and the naïve expectation that a trained mind will be able to do almost anything and bring the kingdom of God forthwith still lingers among the choice superstitions of the American intellect. Not that it has not had certain rude shocks, especially lately, and that gradually it is filtering into the common mind that educational training is only one kind of training, and that what is called an edu-

cated man is a man who has, as the case now stands, one point of view of life, and usually only one, and that a very narrow and very distorted one, crammed into his brain; that the so-called educated man has a bundle of prejudices which make him, as well as the uneducated man, an unfair dictator of the social life and purposes of the multitude. In other words, education so-called is seen to be merely one form of life, and that it may, under its most favorable conditions, not only not make for social advance, but may make for social deterioration; that it may destroy the activity and building up of the social conscience; that it may elevate false moral standards, and enthrone viewpoints which in their logical development forbid social advance; indeed, that the university may itself be the last stronghold of social injustice, and that every such institution not subject to popular control is a danger-spot in democratic life; in short, that a university which is not allied to the public educational system, and subject to public inspection and regulation, may be the worst kind of a social force in the community, and infinitely more dangerous to the moral health of the nation because it hides its real effects under the fair seeming name of education.

UNIVERSITIES AND THE CRIMINAL RICH.

One of the most interesting and suggestive symptoms of the possibilities in this direction may be found in the increasing natural alliance between the malefactors of great wealth so-called and their criminal associates and the universities of almost every name and kind throughout the land, except those under public direction and control. The almost continuous story of crime among the very wealthy men of the great corporate and other organizations of the country discloses also that these names are also those which figure largely and most

frequently in some form of endowment and giving to the great colleges of the land. In this way Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and others are at this moment using money which is known to have been amassed by thieves robbing in some instances the widows and the orphans. Some of these foundations actually bear the names of the thieves who thus sought to divide the proceeds with alma mater, and who, till they were discovered, were *persona grata* in all that was loveliest and best in the official university life. These are names we used to see at the official and social assemblages as among the men the university delighted to honor and put forth as the representative product of the college,—“sons of the college who had done well,” as a professor of Christian morals felicitously put it on one occasion. Since these “sons of the college who have done well” have been discovered to be among the most expert and abandoned criminals in the land, has the college hastened to disown her sons who had not only not done well but ill? No, indeed; she has serenely kept close to her other sons of great wealth who have not yet been discovered, and has deplored “savage attacks upon capital” and other frightful depredations against society. To this, however, one very notable and striking exception must be recorded. President Hyde of Bowdoin did bring to the attention of the undergraduates at that college the fact that a great criminal and exploiter had been a student there, and warned his young men against a similar career. A wonderful and marvelous exception to the rule.

Nor is this alliance of the criminal rich with the university accidental. The university itself has become a financial institution with a huge capital and with a huge fund which must be made and kept productive. It must buy stocks and bonds and make investments, and this of necessity allies it with the

financial interests. It does not require very clever thinking to see that the financial interests of the university lie along the pathway of the financially influential and prosperous. Under the most favorable conditions it is easy to see how the paramount influence in the university readily becomes a financial influence, and that the habit of deference to expert financial opinion (even though later it proves to have been the opinion of looters, thieves, railroad wreckers, and common gamblers) soon becomes the university habit. The very legitimate character of much of this intercourse opens the way for a constantly increasing power by the financial interests over the university authorities. Then, again, when the competition becomes stronger, and the universities enter, as they have entered, upon one of the fiercest contests ever known, namely, for size and endowment and equipment, and millions are needed, to whom shall they go but to the millionaire exponents of high finance? Now it happens that we have lately seen that high finance is for the most part corrupt. We have seen that men honored in church and university and academic council have exhibited a character status which differs in no way, except in degree, from that of the common thieves and burglars who fill the common jails. Some of them have had the strength of mind to get themselves out of the world, to the world's betterment. But their beneficiaries—the men who feted and dined and wine and honored them, and ate their dinners, and honored them with degrees—they are still in the universities, and they still stand as sponsors for the intellectual leadership of American youth. Can this continue? Obviously not. Nothing but the most absurd discrediting of the simplest abilities of the average man can hope that such an institution can have much influence with the public mind; while, as for “raising the tone of democracy,” such a sugges-

tion simply fills the air with laughter. Who shall it be that shall raise the tone of democracy,—the Harvard Hydes, the Yale Depews, or the Princeton Alexanders?

The apologist may come forward at this point, and say that the universities have no supernatural means of knowing who is honest and who is dishonest. Certainly not. But it seems they have no better powers of observation and judgment than the common mass of men either. It is their very specialty which is impeached, namely, to discern the tendencies and influences which are at work among men, and to guide the less illuminated multitude in the pathway of sound discrimination. Professor James says that "the best claim which a college education can possibly make on your respect, the best thing it can aspire to accomplish for you is this: *that it should help you to know a good man when you see him.*" The italics are his own. But have the universities shown any particular prescience in this respect? Have they known the good men of high finance from the bad men? Why then are so many of the most discredited names linked to university foundations and lectureships and other university functions and privileges? If Professor James is right, the universities have failed at the very heart to do the thing which he thinks is the one thing they should enable men to do. But they have not only failed in this, but they have given the high seats of honor to the corruptors and thieves who happened to be rich.

UNIVERSITIES AND THE POLITICALLY CORRUPT.

Leave now the sphere of financial alliance between the university and the criminal rich, and enter the political sphere and see what the relation is between the notorious beneficiaries and representatives of political corruption in municipality, state, and nation, and the colleges. Here again we are confronted with a state of affairs similar to that which prevails in

finance. The university, which ought "to know a good man when it sees him" and teach its students likewise, not only does not go behind the returns, but flies in the face of obvious common knowledge in bringing to its platform men who are known throughout the length and breadth of the state and nation as political corruptors. The influence behind this, however, it must be admitted, is that the corruptionists are such because they are allied to and usually representatives of the predatory interests also; and since these through their financial representatives have commanding influence in the university counsels, they easily and readily influence in the appearance, in honor, of their political agents, it may be in the United States Senate, it may be in the House of Representatives, or some lesser office. To gain the recognition of your university in public life you need only what you need with the lowest politicians and strikers, namely, win. How you win and what means you use are overlooked in the fact that you actually won. Probably if you win twice you will be a marshal at commencement parade, and if you win several times you may become an officer in the university. That you slaughtered the morals of a whole congressional district, and made bribery and drunkenness and debauchery the rule at the humblest cross-roads throughout the district, is of no consequence at all. The university should know a good man when it sees him, but apparently university morality, that is, official recognition morality, is made by winning, whether in a stock exchange gamble or a political debauch. Men who are now in middle life can recall the days when the great civil service reform revival called into being and utterance some of the finest political idealisms this country has ever known. How the university was stirred by them, and the undergraduate youth felt nothing so thoroughly, and longed for nothing so

steadily or finely, as to be allied with these majestic men whose note of civic purity was like a gospel in politics. It was a gospel in politics, and nothing less! Contrast that epoch with the march of the bribe-giving and perjured public officers throughout the academic halls. Compare it with the men who sit in the seats of the mighty at commencement and pass out platitudes to the undergraduates, men whose pathway in public life is one long streak of moral degradation and shame, but who, having the powers of finance behind them, were able to win. Why has the college man in politics become a hissing? Because the college man has been found to be like other men except that he brought exceptional talents to the work of political jobbery, and was able to avoid the dirtiest of the dirty work by hiring men to do it for him. Take, for example, the Essex district of Massachusetts, where these lines are written, and we have, as the representative in Congress, a son of Harvard College, who is there by the most shameless and demoralizing debauchery that could possibly prevail in any district in the land. Language cannot do justice to some of the results of this debauchery, which was open, shameless, confessed, has been denied by nobody, and is beyond refutation or apology. Yet in the last election this person was able to bring to his support, in his fight for reelection, when decency was in revolt, an ex-governor of the Commonwealth, three attorneys-general of the Commonwealth, three congressmen, one United States Senator, a Justice-elect of the Supreme Court of the United States, and finally a letter from the President of the United States, though not a single one of this great aggregation of forces had one syllable to say in refutation of specific, detailed, and particular charges of debauchery and corruption which were brought on the platform every night against the man whom they were helping to

reëlect. Probably no district in the United States had so great a force of notabilities sent into it. And the striking thing about it is, that they were all college men, from the President down. They were the college output as it operates in public life, and each and every one of them knew that the charges were true, and some of them in private admitted them to be true, but felt the pressure of political necessity, the shameless incumbent being the son-in-law of a United States senator, also a distinguished Harvard alumnus, and frequently honored by his alma mater. This was the one thing which university training and university influence ought to have made impossible. Yet it was university men who were assembled to maintain and perpetuate, as they did maintain and perpetuate, a situation which is as absolutely one of criminal prostitution as can be found in American public life. In other words, the university influence and environment acted here just as it did in the matter of the scoundrels of high finance. The bond was as strong, for this criminaloid congressman was also a rich man, and the social tie to the university that made the Hyde lectures also made the university influences rally to the support of the political corruptionist.

For twenty years the favorite public man at Yale University was the man who is now among the degraded public men of the nation, and who misrepresents New York in the Senate of the United States. But apparently Yale was no better able "to know a good man when it saw him" than Harvard. The speeches of this particular man were wont to be exploited by the university as among the finest type of the Yale product in public life. But just where does the discovery that he was not only a hypocrite, but a thoroughly corrupt and degraded man, leave the gentlemen and the institution, who were proud to put forth this particular man as the finest product of the

Yale theory of education in public service? If they say they did not know and had no supernatural means of information, then they must abdicate with the distinguished company at Cambridge all ability of knowing a good man when they see him or having any better powers in this direction than less educated people. The truth, however, is far simpler. He represented wealth. That was his open sesame. He represented power and high finance (stolen from widows and orphans too), but the university had to have its alliances with the powerful, and university investments must be kept productive. How ridiculous has the scholar in politics become! There is a favorite story among Tammany men of a college man who came to Tammany, and, till they knew him, they respected his supposed scruples against the lower forms of political procedure. When they knew him they felt differently, and one of them, speaking of this particular man, said, "By —, that fellow is the limit. He made a new record for *me*." And the present writer heard the man thus referred to say, with cynical indifference to the opinions of the college bred, when he was asked what they might think of his choice of means and alliances, "I don't care a d—— what they think. All I need, to be cheered next commencement, when I go back, is to win." And right he was. And he went back, and was introduced as the victorious hero of many a hard-fought political battle, and cheered to the echo at the university. His name had been dragged through the mire, and he was guilty of political debaucheries without number, open and unconcealed, but his college honored him! Did the college know or had success made right? Every one knows, who has thought about it at all and has observed university practice in this regard in recent years, that the university has simply either shut its eyes entirely to the means by which its eminent graduates have become rich or has taken

their success as the measure of their moral status. And the university as an institution has been in alliance with political corruption in exactly the same way as it has been in alliance with corrupt finance.

UNIVERSITIES AND PROFESSIONAL IDEALS.

A distinguished New York lawyer, the Hon. Edward M. Shepard, addressing the Illinois Bar Association in 1907, began his address by saying:—

“We American lawyers who are not already moralists, as by virtue of our office all of us ought to be, must become moralists right soon if the profession is longer to hold the powerful place in American public life which has traditionally belonged to it for a century and a half. . . . We must frankly confess that the American lawyer has lost some of his preference and prestige in political life . . . the profession has to remember that its ability practically to influence the masses of men in their affairs of politics and state, depends upon the measure of popular belief in its devotion to the general welfare of those very masses and upon the measure of popular belief that lawyers are not, whether by money retainer or by ingrained habit of thought, dedicated to the service of narrow, special or selfish interests.”

Here you have a restrained and careful statement, by a leader in his profession, of the status of his profession in the public mind from his point of view. It is entirely optimistic. If any one but a man of Mr. Shepard's standing and power were speaking, he would say that the American lawyer has well nigh lost his position as mentor to the American masses, except when they are forced to resort to him as a power by which they can meet the exactions of some other member of the same profession. It is no exaggeration to say that any assumption of ethical interest by lawyers in the practice of the profession, would in any club in the country produce a convulsion of derisive laughter. And it is even less subject to the charge of exaggeration to say, that the vast mass of the people outside

professional circles do not regard the mass of lawyers as honest men in the sense in which a clerk working for an employer has to be honest or lose his job. Now it is not necessary to affirm this to be the fact. The truth probably is, that honesty is just as certainly existent among lawyers as among clergymen, doctors, or business men, probably no more, no less. But that there has been a distinct decline in professional influence and standards Mr. Shepard has brought out, and many others have again and again stated the same thing. Of the decline in professional ideals among clergymen, many things have been written which need not be discussed here, as it is also not the purpose to discuss the decline of professional ideals among lawyers. The mere fact is the important thing in this discussion. And the distinguished barrister of New York puts his hand quickly upon the cause, namely, when he says that, popularly, legal powers are supposed to be for sale to the highest bidder, and legal abilities can be purchased for every kind of rascality for which legal abilities are employed. Nor is this now a matter of conjecture. Even the lay mind can easily see in the story of the traction frauds in New York City that they would have been impossible without the leadership and skillful manipulation of the leading lawyers of that city, names which figure among the foremost names in the nation's intellectual life. Now it is fair to say that the legal profession is among the most sensitive to university opinion. It is therefore also true to say that, if these gentlemen who represent the highest development of the legal profession had had the slightest intimation that their standing as lawyers and gentlemen would have suffered at the academic centers, by reason of their serving these scoundrels of high finance (they are the constant factors in the problem), and performing these acts which allied their brains

with the robberies, the trickeries, and the frauds, which these men committed, they would have hesitated to render these services. But they knew perfectly well that they stood in no such danger. They were cognizant of the fact that the university authorities were in intimate relationship with the same men for whom they were providing the legal means for duping thousands of innocent investors, and were thereby estopped from criticising them, the mere employees of the financial interests whom the universities were themselves courting. Every one connected with professional life knows that a few leaders make the standards for the whole profession, and that just as soon as it was seen that the leaders of the bar in every city had placed their talents at the command of the predatory corporations and other corrupt interests, the ideals of the profession began to sink, and they have been sinking in the legal profession for twenty years. Just at the present moment the prosecution of many of these interests, made necessary by the breakdown of the colossal framework of fraud which had become too topheavy to sustain its weight, has brought into the foreground a breed of men who seem to be differently fibered. But this, for the moment, is also the pathway to public recognition and preferment, and before its real value to the profession can be estimated it is worth while to wait. The outstanding fact, as the matter now stands, is, that the country has had before it the evidence that the profession upon which it has most to rely for the making and maintaining of its laws has been for the most part sold to the highest bidder, and has furnished to interests now known to be corrupt, vicious, and thoroughly dishonest its choicest intellects for the period of the last twenty years.

Now what was the relation of the university to all this? It was the relation which the academic center, which is the heart

of professional life, sustains to the ideals of the profession. If the profession had even in the slightest degree supposed that by accepting commissions to obfuscate the public and cheat the courts by such performances as characterized the handling of the traction roads in New York City it would incur academic condemnation, there would have been a pause instantly certainly by the men highest up in the profession. But did the heart of the professional life, did the mother of professional ideals, send out to her children any note whatever of how she felt about these things? Has she sent out any note, now that she has seen her learning prostituted to the service of scoundrels? Nobody has heard such a note. On the contrary, these lawyers have been the men she has called back to her halls to indicate what a successful lawyer is like. In other words, the custodian of the professional ideal gave over her custody to the same interest to whom she had given her material interest, and thus she completed the circle of her own shame. Having accepted the bounty of the corrupt, she was bound to condone the practices of those who served them. Many young lawyers have told the present writer that this fact of the purchasability of the best legal talent for any use whatever, was the most perplexing ethical question before them, and was constantly raising distressing questions of personal honor and uprightness.

Professional ideals are made in the university, and are as surely the product of university opinion as is the education which makes the professional life itself. It is therefore fairly chargeable to the want of sound opinion at the universities that the legal profession has steadily declined in power and usefulness and prestige as regards the higher forms of American life and social development. Indeed, as regards this particular profession, though *mutatis mutandis*, the same

thing is true of every other profession, the culpability is specially great, since the law has so much to do with social advance of every kind. The administration of the courts and the general attitude toward laws and law-making is itself one of the greatest of social forces, and its contamination may therefore be said to be a matter of particular importance. If the men who are to interpret the laws, and who are to make the public opinion which prevails in respect to its judgments of the relation between the administration of the law and the administration of justice, lose their sense of the social significance of these things, the loss is something almost too fearful to contemplate; and this, in fact, in some cases has actually happened. The insurance thieves, for example, had been so fortified by legal opinions and legal advice that it is not hard to believe that some of them thought they had a perfect right to do the things which they did. Indeed, in almost all the exposures of great corruption in recent years, the curious thing is, that step by step it was given legal basis, and, in the final acts of some of these cases, it was found that the tracks had been so carefully covered, that, while all the facts were known, skillful reservations and ambiguities made criminal incarceration and conviction impossible. And thus the public has seen the legal profession at its lowest, the highest talent employed for the purpose of enabling thieves in high finance to avoid the consequences of their crimes; while lesser men were unable to employ such talent, which they could not afford, and therefore went to jail. But partnership in this regard by the university cannot be avoided. The school had a duty and a voice in this matter. She uttered no voice, and she abandoned a duty, and she honored her abandoned children to the exclusion of honest men. Upon the university a large share of this riot of crime rests.

UNIVERSITIES AND THE SOCIAL UPRISING.

It will afford an interesting contrast, however, to turn from these attitudes and alliances of the university to the state of mind which has prevailed at the academic centers with reference to the general social advance as represented in the movement of the social body toward a larger and a finer life. It would be interesting to know what, if any, meliorating movement of the last twenty years has received the sponsorship of any university, especially one that affected any "interest" in any appreciable degree? The last twenty years have seen remarkable advances in the conditions of workmen, in the operations of charity and philanthropy. It has seen great movements toward larger liberty and toward the greater restraint of the strong in their grasp upon exclusive privileges; and, indeed, for twenty years the distinctive note of modern society has been the greater equalization of the opportunities and enjoyments of life. In other words, society has set itself to abolish privilege, by whatever name it calls itself, and has set to work resolutely to break down every form of injustice which it can lay hands upon. This has become so much the movement of the best spirits of the time that it constitutes a kind of chivalry of the period, and has enlisted more heart and soul and sacrifice than most people not a part of the movement can imagine. Out of the universities themselves it called a choice group of youth who bravely grappled with the *terra incognita* of the other half of the world, and undertook to know it and to serve it. It practically created a new profession. It injected a kind of poetry into modern life, and began a career of social discovery which is not ended yet. It began with an attitude of humility and self-abnegation which was itself a kind of romance, and simply gave itself to the careful observation and study of the masses of mankind, with a view

to serving them and helping them. Now as a matter of course many of these social pioneers were university men and women. But the university did not teach it to them, nor did the university encourage them until the thing had reached a stage where the imagination was appealed to, and each university had to have a pet social settlement to exploit as one of the evidences of "what our university does for the less favored," etc. But from its beginnings and its earliest developments, this was a human movement that began with passion, fire, and with love. It has grown until it has a thousand activities. It stimulated a thousand new forms of itself, and has overleaped all its original bounds, and is now operating in ways which the original promoters could not possibly have anticipated. In short it has created the modern social uprising, the insistent demand for real democracy. It is at this moment the most vital thing in life among Americans. It is the idealism of America reappearing in forms of social advance and social emergence. Now such movements in the olden times were the outcome of the university spirit and teaching. But synchronously with this movement what has the university as an institution been doing? It has been standing for conservatism, falsely so-called, it has been holding up the hands of the brigands of society, it has been accepting and growing on the endowments of public plunderers, and has made the university the bulwark of the predatory interest. It has excluded from its own halls almost every voice that spoke for the common interest. It had in its sacred desks the men who were the preachers for the most part under the pay of the heads of the special interests whom it sought to ally with its financial foundations. It has had in its chairs the representatives of the theories which denied the rights of the masses and fortified the interests of the few against the many. It made its special

bids to the millionaire, however crude or vulgar, and left many of its honest sons without the recognition or help of the academic friendship in the battles for justice where justice was obviously on their side. Indeed, in the last twenty years it has been the most effectual bar to academic recognition to stand for any popular interest, and the public and the university interest have practically become things ever against each other. In other words, the battles of democracy have gradually revealed, that, in so far as the universities had to be reckoned with, they had to be reckoned as on the side of the intrenched injustice and the moneyed brigandage of the land. That this is not violence in statement may be readily seen by looking over the names which have figured in the academic recognition of the last twenty years, and those which have figured in the discredited financial operations of the same period in so far as these have been laid open to the public. The Hyde dinner which finally brought the rupture which let in light on the Equitable Insurance scandals had university presidents, men of light and leading, present, giving the weight of their academic presence to what is now known to have been the wild orgy of a thief. Of course they did not know! But there stands the fact that the university dignitaries were present, and they did not apparently know a good man or a bad one when they saw him.

But even this could have been forgiven, if the university had not gone farther, and ventured to brand the men who looked for a larger life as enemies of public order, "anarchists," and other undesirable persons. They undertook to rebuke the men who cried out against the now acknowledged social injustice, and undertook to throttle the social conscience just as it was beginning to make itself felt in the wider public relationships of men. Was there a more anarchistic assembly held in the

last twenty years than the Hyde dinner with its luxury, its extravagance, and its wanton waste, while society was groaning with injustice and pain and shame, and millions were hungry and travailing over the ills of life? Every man who was at that dinner should have known, the university heads especially, that underneath that luxury there was groaning a mass of human misery, that should have shocked and awakened them. But the university, the stock exchange, the railroad clique, and the insurance gang of looters were all at one at that assembly. The social conscience there was non-existent. No wonder men held their breath! No wonder a shudder of fear ran through the country as thoughtful men began to contemplate the effect of these things upon the masses. And the uprising of these masses was stimulated even more. But there stood our alma mater smiling beside the looter and the grafter, and bestowing her fairest awards upon the successful enemies of the social whole. If this seems an overdrawn picture, let the reader just quietly go to the library, and look over the records of the past fifteen or twenty years, and see what has been happening, and see what the attitude of the university has been to the social uprising; and then let him wonder why the last place to which the masses turn, "for the clarification of their human sympathies or the elevation of their human preferences," is to the university.

UNIVERSITIES AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

President Eliot, in his address before the Connecticut State Teachers' Association, in 1902, on "More Money for the Public Schools because of the Failures and Shortcomings in American Education," enumerated a number of these shortcomings and the relation of public education to them. It was an interesting exhibit and the conclusions were for the most part fairly drawn, though allowances were not made for cer-

tain complexities and forces which inhere in the nature of public education which do not or ought not to affect education under private auspices and control. A private institution, for example, may, and in general does, prescribe the conditions and qualifications of those who seek its benefits. The public schools cannot make such distinctions. Barring known physical and moral defects which can be justifiably brought to the attention of a public tribunal, the public schools have absolutely no option as to whom they shall receive, and cannot go behind the returns as to antecedents, environment, or other conditions affecting character and habits. A private institution, on the other hand, can do all of these things; and, if it does not do them, it is because of neglect on its own part, not because it has not the powers for such control and inspection prior to the admission of any student. It will be interesting, therefore, to take President Eliot's arraignment of the public schools and, with this distinction in mind, raise the question as to just what difference exists, if any, in its effectiveness when applied to the universities as well as the public schools. In this connection, of course, the privately controlled universities are chiefly in mind. The great state universities are comparatively of so recent origin as, with rare exceptions, like the University of Michigan, not to be reckoned with the great privately controlled universities. Then, too, they, like the public schools, are subject to the distinction above noted.

President Eliot says:—

"For more than two generations we have been struggling with the barbarous vice of drunkenness, but have not yet discovered a successful method of dealing with it. . . . The public schools ought to have made it impossible that benevolence and devotion (in the form of wrong temperance teaching in the schools) should be so misdirected. The courts have failed to deal wisely with habitual drunkards as a class, both the theory and the practice of fines and short imprisonments as applied to drunkards being entirely futile."

But what about the colleges? If there is a more disgraceful chapter in the college life than that which has to do with the drunken orgies of classes at annual dinners and other functions, the present writer, with fifteen years' careful observation of this particular phenomenon before him, does not know it. The very institution over which Dr. Eliot presides has furnished in Boston so many orgies of this character, that a number of the leading hotels in Boston will not now accept contracts to have class suppers held at their houses, because of the drunkenness and the general smash-ups which have followed these affairs. Others require heavy indemnity bonds before the affairs come off, to insure them against losses from such proceedings. But Harvard is not a sinner above all that dwell in Jerusalem. A recent Doctor of Philosophy of Yale states, that, at a recent class reunion of middle-aged men at New Haven, he saw drunken graduates of that university lying in the gutters on the college green. And this is not in the last century but within a very few years! Examples might be multiplied; but these are enumerated, that this statement may not be passed over as a glittering generality with nothing specific. It is safe to say that when the results are carefully examined, in proportion to its per centum of the population, the university men have contributed quite their share of drunkards, and are as much creators and disciples of the "barbarian vice" as any others. The indictment against the public schools holds with tenfold greater force against the colleges, because the latter represents a class of much greater selection.

Again he says:—

"The persistence of gambling in the United States is another disappointing thing to the advocates of popular education. . . . It is a prevalent vice among all savage people, but one which moderate cultivation of the intelligence—a very little foresight and the least

sense of responsibility—should be sufficient to eradicate. . . . The passion for gambling affects the market not only for stocks and bonds but for the great staples of commerce and the necessities of life.”

And here again how do the colleges compare with the public schools? The children play craps and other small gambling games, but President Eliot can see from his house a place where stock quotations are given daily in Cambridge, or used to be, for the students who gamble throughout their college course. A similar place is much frequented in New Haven, and the form of gambling which best suits the temperament and class in life of the students, finds as full and perhaps fuller expression among the university population as among any other; while the great stock gamblers of the country, the men who do the thing on the large scale which affects the masses of mankind, are, as previously stated, many of them, men actively allied to college endowments and benefactions and administration. If the case against the public schools is a bad one (and it is), the case against the colleges is vastly worse.

Again President Eliot alludes to the disappointment with reference to universal suffrage, and holds that popular education here has not done what we expected it to do. But here again, without leaving the boundaries of his own city or his own state, he can see university men allied to every form of corruption and misuse of public service that exists in the Commonwealth. He can see the State of Connecticut held in the leash of an obsolete and utterly unjust form of government at the behest and by the power of men trained in Yale University, who are in the dominant political machine of that State. He can go among the graduates of the universities of the land and he can find the conspicuous offenders against civic and social righteousness bearing degrees often honorary of the highest institutions of the land. The distinction be-

tween the university and the public schools cannot be found. If any exist, all the facts considered, the balance is against the university, especially when we consider that the non-voting, civic-indolent population is almost always the university bred. In New York it is an axiom among the reformers, that there is more conscience on the lower East Side than on the avenues, and the Back Bay of Boston rarely votes except in a great crisis, and then only because the money nerve drives it.

"Since one invaluable result of education is a taste for good reading, the purchase by the people of thousands of tons of ephemeral reading matter which is not good in either form or substance, shows that one great end of popular education has not been attained. . . . From the point of view of the social philosopher or the ethical reformer this is the worst disappointment of all in regard to the results of common school education in the nineteenth century."

But ask an honest undergraduate, or ask any honest graduate of fifteen years' standing, on this subject, and you will find that the mass of the university-bred men have as their chief literary diet the newspaper and these not always the best. The ten-cent magazine, which Professor James suggests as a possible supplanter of the university as a great educative force, stands next, and probably the vast majority of the men not actually in professions which require book reading, will frankly admit that they are not reading men. If this indictment is true and sound as to the public schools, and it appears to be, though President Eliot is not just to the masses in this respect, as in most things, it is a thousand times more condemnatory of the men who have been through college. In fact, the "masses," strictly speaking, are not the buyers of the ten-cent magazines. The advertisements show who make and support the ten-cent magazines. Here again, proportionately, the indictment holds equally against the college as well as the

public school. In fact, when the conditions are taken into account, the balance is again against the college.

And last among the things which we shall select in this contrast is the theater. President Eliot says: "If the public education had been mentally and morally adequate, surely the public theater would be very much better than it is to-day." Possibly the distinguished head of Harvard has not attended the chorus-girl shows and the claptrap stuff with which the theatrical trust has flooded the American stage and made it a scandal. But let any show peculiarly bad come to Boston or New Haven or any other university city, and he will see the college crowd conspicuously lined up in the front rows. In fact, the undergraduate support of such things is one of the things which have led to their exploiting so extensively. It is a curious ignorance of the facts that fixes on the public schools in this matter as the reprehensible influence. If there is a peculiar spot where the college lawlessness, the college rowdiness, the college want of breeding and taste, and the college lack of manliness and fairness have come to the surface with greater force than any other, it is in connection with the degraded shows of the modern theater. Evidently the colleges have not helped much in this matter.

Now in all this there is no want of recognition of the forces on the other side. The good men in the universities, the noble graduates who labor for the public good, and the minority who come out of the universities prepared to make some sacrifice for the public good commensurate with the privileges which they have enjoyed,—not one of them is overlooked. But, viewed from the same angle from which President Eliot views the public schools, and in the same spirit, the university-bred population have not justified their cost to the country, and the universities as social institutions have failed quite as

much as the public schools. In fact, their failure has been greater because they have furnished the leaders of the great predatory enterprises, they have furnished the stock gamblers and market manipulators, and they have not denied to these social pests academic recognition and fellowship. This fact is one reason which has in the Western States steadily caused the rising tide in favor of state universities. Democracy has seen higher education perverted to the use of an exploiting class, and has seen the institutions which should have been the liberators become the allies of those who have sought to make private gain of public necessity. It was probably this fact which led President Hadley some years ago to propose social ostracism as a punishment for these persons. But has Yale ostracised anybody except those who were actually caught with the "goods on"? Of course not. Nor has any university which has had to rely upon its alliance with the stock market and the clearing-house to keep its funds productive. Even the literary product of these institutions has, much of it, been of the same character, as will be shown in some subsequent discussion. The present outstanding fact is, that, as related to the struggle for social advance, the universities have, as of yore, been against the popular interest, and the privately controlled institution has steadily stood against the progress of democratic ideals and their realization. And it has done more. Many young men who came to it full of high and sacrificial notions of public service and devotion, it has weaned away from these passionate strivings of youth, and substantially bidden them first to put money in their purses and then strive to lift the body politic. And in this influence, the church, the state, and the social fabric alike have been weakened and made more subject to the social ills inherent in our gigantic experiment in universal suffrage and popular government.

ARTICLE V.

CAN SECULARISM DO IT?

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM HARRISON, CORNWALL,
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, CANADA.

THE following statements will at once indicate the principles and positions which distinguish some of the schools of modern unbelief, and which have been advocated by a number of individuals around whose names no little fame has already gathered.

"To us it is conceivable that in some minds the deep pathos lying in the thought of human mortality—that we are here for a little while and then vanish away, that this earthly life is all that is given to our loved ones and to our many suffering fellowmen—lies nearer the fountains of *moral* emotion than the conception of extended existence."¹

George J. Holyoake, who passed away a few years ago, at the advanced age of eighty-nine years, and who was a recognized leader of Secularism in England for many years, declared, in his "Principles of Secularism," that "Secularism proposes to regulate human affairs by considerations purely human." And it is a primal tenet of the Secularistic school that, "whatever we do, our motives must be sought only within the circle of the present."

The late Mr. W. R. Greg, one of the class of so-called "serious skeptics" so characteristic of the present day, appeared to be in full sympathy with the foregoing sentiments,

¹ George Elliot, art. on "Worldliness and Other Worldliness," Westminster Review, January, 1857.

and in his "Creed of Christendom" he has the following remarks:—

"It is only those who feel a deep interest in and affection for this world, who will work resolutely for its amelioration; those whose affections are transferred to heaven, acquiesce easily in the miseries of earth, give them up as hopeless, as ordained, and console themselves with the idea of the amends which are one day to be theirs. If we had looked upon this earth as our only scene, it is doubtful if we should so long have tolerated its more monstrous anomalies and more curable evils. But it is easier to look to a future paradise than to strive to make one on earth; and the depreciating and hollow language of preachers has played into the hands of the insincerity and the indolence of mankind" (p. 251).

Some time ago, Winnewoode Reed, one of England's literati, died, and among the last things which he penned was the following:—

"I have given up the old Gospel, with its immortalities, and have accepted the religion of humanity, which is love virtuously, honor the planet on which you dwell, and then, first and noblest of animals, die, and go to the dust, and that is all."

In these selections, which could easily be multiplied, we have the representations and claims of modern secularism and materialism, and with one bold sweep of the hand, that religion which has been the chief source of all beneficent civilization, basis of true culture, cause of refinement, foundation of morals, and the one great spring of comfort and happiness to mankind, is ignored, set aside, or snuffed out like some insignificant candle, as something belonging to the shadows of dreamland, or as being worse than useless when confronted with the needs, the sorrows, and sad conditions which mark the struggling human world in which we live!

The chief purpose of the present article is to call in question these positions and claims, so loudly announced by the leaders of the Agnostic and Materialist schools, and to point out the

fact that the renowned hypothesis of a pure worldliness, for which so much is predicted and claimed, has never borne the goodly fruit so confidently promised by its famous chiefs; but, on the contrary, its historic career has been distinguished by failures of the most humiliating and undeniable kind. When fairly tested in the "mad farce of this wicked world," and the actual deplorable conditions which so largely prevail, it has demonstrated not only its almost utter inability to inaugurate a single grand reform, but has constantly been letting loose certain elements of social disorder and moral ruin, the sad monuments and proofs of which remain until this day. To represent Christianity, with its sublime teachings respecting another state or world, as unfitting men for the present by making them indifferent to its pursuits, duties, obligations, miseries, and claims, is a statement so glaring in its falseness as to be unworthy of a calm and serious reply. To base an objection against the Christian religion on the monastic, gloomy asceticism and unfaithfulness of some who have professed to be its disciples, is to involve its advocates in a theory which, in its logical application and execution, would be destructive of all the noble callings, professions, and institutions which are to-day the world's benediction and its distinguishing, unfading crown. That system of unbelief which is compelled to occupy such ground as this is certainly reduced to the most pitiable straits, and it is an unconscious confession of the erroneous and indefensible foundations on which it rests. The impotence and inability of all systems which repudiate a supernatural religion to work out the world's regeneration and secure for our million-peopled earth nobler and happier conditions is evident when the following considerations receive the attention and recognition which they constantly demand:—

THE CONFESSIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS OF MODERN
UNBELIEF.

In the *Nineteenth Century* some years ago, is found an article on the "Agnostic at Church," written by a professed member of the Agnostic school, and containing some confessions, at once indicating the helplessness of this system of negations, about which so much has been said and prophesied in the present day. In answer to the question, whether one who believes nothing can be known of God should join in a worship which is based on the assumption that He can be known and that He is known, this writer arrives at the conclusion that he should join in such worship; and the chief reasons adduced are, first, "that the teachings of the Church do more good than harm, directly and indirectly," and he acknowledges "the enormous influence for good that every one of us must have seen arising from the teaching of religion now as in all past ages."

In addition to this confession, contained in the paper referred to, another admission is made, which carries with it a force and significance which we do well to note. This writer frankly recognizes the fact that Agnosticism does not possess that "moral lifting power" which the vast masses of men need to arrest the downward tendencies within and without, and elevate them to lives of truth and righteousness. He remarks that "the Agnostic, with his abstract ideas of Deity and Humanity, is powerless to affect the masses of mankind." And yet these applauded apostles of modern negation would practically ignore and undermine and eventually destroy that faith which has ennobled and blessed the thronging multitudes of men during the sixty generations of the past!

Professor Huxley has correctly said "that we live in a world that is full of misery and ignorance, and the plain duty

of each and all of us is to try to make the little corner he can influence somewhat less ignorant than it was before he entered it." With this sentiment we will not find fault, for ignorance and misery, vice, sin, and immorality, abound on every hand; and the plain duty of all is to remove this sad condition of things as far as they possibly can. So far, then, most all are agreed, but the grand question is, How is this desired and beneficent result to be accomplished? On this point Professor Huxley says: "To do this effectively it is necessary to be fully persuaded of only two beliefs—the first, that the order of nature is ascertainable by our faculties to an extent which is practically unlimited; and the second is, that our volition counts for something as a condition of the course of events."

However plausible this proposed method or remedy may appear to be on paper, when brought into the countless ranks of our fellow-men, who are the subjects and victims of social and moral degradations, and confronted by the broad world of human want and actuality, it will be seen that these two vague beliefs are utterly unable to bring about the great social and general reformation which the case demands. Frederic Harrison, a follower of Comte, in an article in the *Nineteenth Century*, for October, 1880, frankly avowed that

"the physical speculations usually called Science, Materialism, Evolution, Agnosticism, Free-thought and all other schemes in fashion to-day, do not touch the problem of man's moral and social basis at all, and in spite of philosophy, from Hume to Spencer, the old theology maintains its social authority, if not its mental sway, alike in a materialized England, in a Voltairean France, and in a sceptical Germany."

He goes on to say that "Science gives no unity to life, no rule of conduct, no support of the soul. Together modern science and philosophy, stopping helplessly where they do,

have chilled, paralyzed, and almost killed the spirit of Devotion, of Veneration, of Self-abasement, of Self-surrender to a great, Over-ruling Power." "Philosophy and Science," he admits, "have given us priceless things, but we say they have given us no Religion, no Providence, no Supreme Centre of our thoughts and of our loves." They answer, that they have never assumed so high a mission, and that it is no part of their function. "Unworthy answer," he exclaims, "in which your present impotence is written! Inasmuch as, year by year, for centuries, they have been taking away this supreme basis of all human life, they were bound to supply the true basis when they took away the false." This writer, though far away from the ranks of orthodoxy, and endeavoring to find satisfaction in Positivism, believes that faith in a personal God, and a religion based upon this faith, is absolutely necessary to a true, peaceful, and noble life, and he ridicules those who hold to nothing else but a mere Humanism as the regenerator of society, and the ennoblement of the world. "This Humanism dreads discipline; it has no moral stamina; it passes into scepticism, impotent capacity to come to a decision and thence on to effeminacy, grossness, unnatural passion, or ignoble dreaming." With reference to the speculations of men of the Matthew Arnold type, who are perpetually talking about the "Eternal" (not ourselves) "that makes for righteousness" and the idea of God being defecated to a pure transparency, he declares that all such theorizing is mere words. It will hallow no life and enlighten no spirit. Let who will, be it in piety or utter bewilderment, or the mere wish to say something, erect altars to the "Unknown God, . . . a Grand Perhaps is not God; to dogmatize about the Infinite, to guess, to doubt, to fear, to hope there is a future life—that is not to have a religion whereby to live and die."

Mr. J. S. Mill, the apostle of modern utilitarianism, whilst ignoring the means and remedies proposed by Christianity for the moral elevation of the race, has propounded various methods for the social reformation of society and the world, and he was permitted to live long enough to see that many of his grand theories were little more than the broodings of a prejudiced imagination, and the legitimate fruit of so many splendid but unsubstantial and baseless dreams. After watching the effects of his teachings upon the practical, everyday life of the multitudes around him, he makes the following suggestive and significant confession:—

“In England I had seen and continued to see many of the opinions of my youth obtain general recognition, and many of the reforms in institutions, for which I had through life contended, either effected or in course of being so. But these changes had been attended with much less benefit to human well-being than I should formerly have anticipated, because they had produced very little improvement in that which all real amelioration in the lot of mankind depends on, their intellectual and moral state; and it might even be questioned if the various causes of deterioration which had been at work in the meanwhile, had not more than counterbalanced the tendencies to improvement. I had learned from experience that any false opinions may be exchanged for true ones, without in the least altering the habits of mind of which false opinions are the results. . . . I am now convinced, that no great improvements in the lot of mankind are possible, until a great change takes place in the fundamental constitution of their modes of thought.”¹

Is there not here an indirect recognition of the need of a moral regeneration which the teachings and influences of Secularism have been utterly unable to effect? And is there not something like an unconscious orthodoxy, which contemplates a spiritual transformation before the world can reach those conditions of peace, progress, and happiness of which the leaders of Materialism had done little else than

¹ *Autobiography*, pp. 238, 239.

speculate and dream? The late Mr. Greg was in full sympathy with the same view, and wrote as follows:—

“In truth, those only can safely and serviceably encounter social evils who can both watch, and in some measure imitate, God’s mode of dealing with them. . . . Few, we believe, will ever effect real, radical, permanent social amelioration, who endeavored to cure evils by direct enactment; whose feelings are too keen and sensitive to wait the time of the Most High, and to contemplate with unflinching faith and patience the sufferings continued through, or by reason of, the remedial process, sometimes even aggravated by it.”¹

In modern heresy, with reference to the mingled splendor and shame of human nature, the old rose-colored pictures of humanity, as drawn by many of the earlier skeptics, are here laid completely aside, and unlooked-for confirmations of the Christian religion in reference to man’s true condition are found in secularistic literature on almost every hand.

The representations of the actual state and history of mankind in the various and prolonged ages of their existence, as given by Mr. Greg, are like so many quotations from that book from whose teachings so many have sailed away into an ocean of doubt and uncertainty with no grand outfit to guide them on their cheerless and stormy way. “Man is such a ‘pie-bald miscellany’ with his

“‘Bursts of great-heart, and slips in sensual mire;’”

the discrepancy is so vast between our highest actual and our most moderate ideal; the follies of men are so utterly astonishing, to one who has seen them close; their weakness so profoundly despicable, their vices so unspeakably revolting; their virtues even, so casual, halting, and hollow; life such a comedy to those who think, such a tragedy to those who feel, its pages are so sadly and incomprehensibly grotesque! And he says that—

¹ *Enigmas of Life* (4th ed.), pp. 160, 161.

"Our greatest thinkers have lived and died in sorrow because they could arrive only at conclusions, both in speculations and in actual life, from which it was impossible to escape, yet in which it was impossible to rest. Grand capacities, which seemed adequate to the mightiest achievements, inwoven weaknesses which dishonored those capacities and rendered those achievements hopeless and unattainable; germs and specimens of virtues approaching the Divine, and promising a glorious future, yet dashed with imperfections and impulses which seem to hint of a low origin and a still lower destiny; vast steps forward to a lofty goal,—recreant backslidings towards the bottomless abyss; ages of progress and enlightenment, followed by ages of darkness and retrogression; unmistakable indications of a mighty purpose and an ulterior career, undeniable facts which make those indications seem a silly mockery; much to excite the fondest hopes, much to warrant the uttermost despair; beautiful affections, noble aspirations, pure tastes, fine intellects, measureless delights, all the elements of Paradise,—

"'But the trail of the serpent still over them all.'"

And now come the sad, sad confessions and lamentations of all true men who have looked at the race from an unchristian standpoint:—

"And, as from their watchtowers of contemplation, the wise and good have brooded over these baffling contradictions, what marvel that one by one they should have dropped off into their graves—sorrowing and wondering if peradventure behind the great black vell of death they might find the key to the mysteries which saddened their noble spirits upon earth."¹

Stuart Mill was profoundly conscious of the insufficiency of his own theories to meet the deep wants of life, and provide for him a friendly abiding shelter from the storms of life. In the tenets of his philosophy there was an absence of those mighty motives which present an inspiring influence and power to men amid the trying and arduous duties of man's life and work. Working for mankind on the principles of a pure, brief worldliness, he felt that something more was needed to sustain him till his plans were accomplished, and

¹ *Enigmas of Life*, pp. 137, 138.

his long-applauded and cherished work was done. Here is his confession, which carries with it a force and significance which we do well to note: "I became persuaded," he says, "that my love of mankind and of excellence for its *own sake* had worn itself out." In the moral crises of his early manhood, living in an atmosphere of Atheism, chill and dreary as the grave, we find him turning to suicide as its natural resource. "I frequently asked myself, if I could, or if I was bound to go on living, when life must be passed in this manner. I generally answered to myself, that I did not think I could possibly bear it beyond a year,"¹

And a fitting conclusion to one of the most disappointing and dreariest of Autobiographies is found in the epitaph which this man of worldly fame selected for his tombstone; viz. "Most Unhappy."

Though the individuals who form the ranks of modern negation and unbelief stoutly rebel against what they are pleased to call the "east wind of authority," and the "sloppy talk of sentimentalists," they cannot but acknowledge the incompleteness of all their speculations and hypotheses to reach and cover all the great wants connected with our existence in the manifold stages of its wondrous development. The cold heights of metaphysical abstraction, the "Utopian dreams of socialism," and the "airy nothings" of prejudiced, unlicensed, and unbridled imagination, cannot meet the deeper wants of the human heart, or provide any substantial and satisfying answers to the deeper questions which have pressed themselves upon mankind in all ages, generations, and climes.

Tyndall himself has said that "no Atheistic reasoning can dislodge religion from the heart of man. . . . The logical

¹ Autobiography, p. 140.

feebleness of physical science is not sufficiently borne in mind." Again he says, "Behind and above, and around all, the real mystery of this universe lies unsolved, and, as far as we are concerned, is incapable of solution." In his first preface, in which he seems to give expression to true and genuine feeling, he says:—

"I have noticed, during years of self-observation, that it is not in hours of clearness and vigour that this doctrine [that of material Athelism] commends itself to my mind; that in the presence of stronger and healthier thought, it ever dissolves and disappears, as offering no solution of the mystery in which we dwell, and of which we form a part."

Huxley, on a certain occasion, said: "Have I not given my testimony that the religious sentiments are the noblest and most humane of man's emotions?" On another occasion he surprised his hearers by saying, "I, individually, am no materialist, but, on the contrary, believe materialism to involve grave philosophic error." Darwin, too, acknowledged that the question respecting the existence of a Creator and Ruler of the Universe has been answered in the affirmative "by the highest intellects that ever lived."

Herbert Spencer has also frankly confessed that the "Atheistic theory is not only absolutely unthinkable, but, even if it were thinkable, would offer no solution of life, and the universe in which that life is found." The language of George Holyoake, in spite of his downright unbelief, admits his strong yearning for another life. In one of the most touching passages in his writings, he speaks of his strong desire for a future life, in which he should again enjoy the society of his daughter, lost to him—according to his theory—forever. His words are:—

"'My dada's coming to see me,' Madeline exclaimed on the night

of her death, with that full, pure, and thrilling tone which marked her when in health. 'I am sure he is coming to-night, mamma;' and then, remembering that that could not be, she said, 'Write to him, mamma, he will come to see me.' And these were the last words that she uttered; and all that remains now, is the memory of that cheerless, fireless room, and the midnight reverberation of that voice which I would give a new world to hear again."

"Yes," he says, "I shall be pleased to find a life after this; a future life, bringing with it the admission to such companionship, would be a noble joy to contemplate." But his position of unbelief slays all such expectations, and shrouds them in the habiliments of a despair dark and dreary as the very regions of the death.

Thomas Cooper, when his mind was under the malignant dominion of a godless infidelity, penned the following lines as he contemplated the gloomy land of annihilation to which he fancied himself moving. He exclaims:—

"Farewell, grand sun! How my weak heart revolts
At that appalling thought—that my last look
At thy great light must come! O, I could brook
The dungeon, though eterne! the priest's own hell,
Ay, or a thousand hells, in thought, unshook,
Rather than nothingness! And yet the knell,
I fear, is near that sounds—To Consciousness, farewell."

The insufficiency of this merely *earthly* theory to accomplish its oft-repeated predictions of blessing and of good is seen in the

MORAL IMPOTENCE AND INDOLENCE WHICH IT CONSTANTLY DISPLAYS.

The do-nothing, and unbeneficent character of modern unbelief is at once suggestive of the humiliating inability of its principles to help forward this great, struggling, suffering, and needy world in which we live, move, and have our being.

If the brevity of man's life on earth is calculated in itself to move society to warm and pathetic feelings for our fellows, surely that class of men who are wearing the livery of unbelief, and are evermore proclaiming what they call the gospel of utilitarianism, are giving some practical expression of their profound human sympathies in some grand endeavor to heal the multitudes of the needy, and are blended in some far-reaching alliance whose special object is to scatter the rose-leaves for man's bleeding feet, and bear away the woes and miseries of a bruised, tear-bathed and suffering race!

Surely that school which professes such dislike for the "drum ecclesiastic" is enthusiastically engaged in hushing "the sob, the sigh, the low-tone throbs of heart-chords snapping." For such efforts and institutions, however, we look almost in vain. The long-neglected and degraded races, forming, as they do, such a large section of the population of the globe, are, so far as modern unbelief is concerned, left to care for themselves as best they can; and this means the perpetuation of an existence over which there reigns a worse than Arctic gloom, and a darkness deeper than earth's darkest night. For the hospitals and asylums erected by the agnostic school so much affected by the fact of man's existence, and the teachings of a pure worldliness, we look, but, alas! we look in vain. Those who magnify the tenets of Secularism have strangely failed to provide a place where human suffering and pain may find a friendly shelter, and a couch upon which it may lean its wearied form in the times of its helplessness and crying need. As the ancient Greek and Roman worlds appear to have been utterly destitute of all institutions of a humane and merciful kind, where the poor and maimed in life might find a place to live and die, amid the consolations and sympathies of their fellow-men; so, even in this twentieth

century, the world is almost unblessed by a single institution constructed on materialistic principles for which so much has been promised, and so much has been so loudly and boastingly claimed! Confronting this "gospel of the flesh," this theory which ignores the Christian's faith and the Christian's Heaven, we may, in the language of another, interrogate it and see what answer it has to give:—

"Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased,
Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,
Rase out the troubles of the brain,
And with some sweet oblivious antidote
Cleanse the stuffed bosom of that perilous stuff
Which weighs upon the heart?"

The reply of an atheistic secularism, as written in the memory of many of its votaries, is found in the language of a deepened sorrow, a thicker, heavier gloom, and a grim and dark despair.

The leaders of the different departments of unbelief in the current age have talked about the sufferings of the unfortunate and poor, and, "dressed in a little brief authority," have spoken, as Carlyle has said, "big, staring, empty words,"—

"Full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing."

The reforms, beneficent changes, and the present practical endeavors for humanity's good, inaugurated by the chiefs of the materialistic philosophy, are strangely absent from to-day's world, and in this do-nothing policy we see at once the impotence of those principles which characterize the schools now under review.

And yet, in spite of the almost utter helplessness and indolence of modern secularism, those men keep on dreaming

about a golden age, a grand millennium, which is yet to dawn upon the world, and to be ushered in by the operation of those principles, which, after centuries of trial, have been distinguished by failures of the most humiliating kind, and, instead of realizing the golden predictions uttered respecting them, have produced a vast harvest of results which are in downright antagonism to all that is elevating, progressive, and pure.

Notwithstanding all this, the advocates of the "New Religion of Humanity" are full of assumptions, and assure us all that great things are still in promise. But, as one has well said, the secularistic philosophy which is to harmonize all contradictions, change citizens into saints, create a golden age of peace and plenty, and make the world bright and blessed, is still on paper:—

"The New Church, which shall have no problems in its creed, no prejudice, no priestcraft, no corruptions, is on paper; the New World, which science and materialism shall create—all knowledge, freedom, wealth, virtue and happiness—is on paper! Paper saints; paper resolutions; paper paradises; paper everything!"

Is it not time that the keen insight and practical turn of this later age should at once pierce this dazzling vision, scatter to the winds the flowing, empty words of this utilitarian dream, and recognize the unveiled delusion of which this glittering mirage of skepticism is principally composed?

PERSONAL CONSIDERATIONS.

Is it not painfully suggestive of the unsoundness and immoral tendencies of the many forms of unbelief which are abroad, when the characters of the acknowledged and influential representatives of those unchristian speculations are passed in review? In controversy, as an admitted and general

rule, personality ought to have no place. Exceptional circumstances, however, may justify a suspension of that rule. Such circumstances, we claim, exist in looking at the subject now before us. Those individuals who have been widely recognized as the leaders of ancient and modern doubt and denial may surely be supposed to illustrate, in a practical manner, the general tendency and results of positions and theories they sought to promulgate and maintain. Condillac, Diderot, D'Alembert, Rousseau, Voltaire, and Paine were not fit models after which to copy a pure and noble life.

Hobbes, as one has said, "presents a curious mixture of boldness, cunning, and cowardice." This man, quoted with applause by the secularists of to-day, says: "It is lawful to make use of ill instruments to do ourselves good. If I were cast into a deep pit, and the devil should put down his cloven foot, I would take hold of it to be drawn up by it." And when this valorous man came, with pitiful reluctance and dismay, to face the inevitable, he said, "I shall be glad to find a hole to creep out of the world at."

David Hume advised a skeptic to preach Christianity, and not to pique himself on his sincerity. He also taught that "there could be no evil in setting free a few ounces of a certain red fluid called blood, when the possessor of it stood in the way of one's interest"; and, further, that "adultery must be practiced, if men would obtain all the advantages of life, and that, if practiced secretly and frequently, it would cease to be scandalous; and it would, by degrees, come to be thought no crime at all." And yet, in view of these shameful statements, this young man is held up by Professor Huxley in his lay sermon, on a Sunday evening, in Edinburgh, as "the most acute thinker of the Eighteenth century," and "one of the greatest men that Scotland has ever produced."

Dr. Johnson said of Bolingbroke, that he was "a scoundrel and a coward; that he loaded a blunderbuss against Christianity, which he had not the courage to fire during his lifetime, but left to a hungry Scotchman a legacy of half a crown, to draw the trigger after he was dead."

Mr. Lecky, in his "Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland," describes the moral character of Lord Bolingbroke as follows:—

"He plunged with reckless impetuosity into the life of dissipation that opened before him, and, in an age of libertines, was conspicuous as a libertine. . . . The chief cause of his failure was his own character. It was the restless spirit of intrigue, which led him to plot against his colleague, and to enter into relations with the Pretender. It was the notorious dissipation of his private life, and the laxity of his opinions which deprived him of the confidence of his own party, and of that of the great majority of the English."

Many more representative names might be easily cited, showing the demoralizing influence of skeptical teachings upon the lives and conduct of those who have placed themselves under their dominion and power. And the melancholy hopelessness and gloomy outlook as to the future, and the sad undertone of sorrow permeating much of the agnostic literature of the time, carries with it a painful significance and unconscious confession of its impotence in the affairs of the world. In making this personal attack, we do not wish, for a moment, to keep out of sight the inconsistencies and moral failings of many who have professed the Christian faith. All that can be fairly said with reference to the moral failures of many Christian men and women, we frankly acknowledge. But the difference between Christianity and modern unbelief, in reference to the immoralities practised under their names, is as wide as the poles asunder. In no system under heaven can we find such condemnations of wrong-doing, hypocrisies, and crimes as Christianity presents; so that, in the very faith

he professes, the Christian meets with no palliation for his sin, but his inconsistencies and iniquities are in direct and shameful contradiction to his professed beliefs, and against the vehement protests and infinite displeasure of Christianity itself. Now the exact contrary, as to morals, may logically and consistently be the case with a thorough believer in what is commonly known as materialism.

Given a man who rejects all ideas which Christians attach to such words as "God" and "Spirit"; who believes that, so far as his own existence is concerned, there is no world but the present; that there is neither life nor judgment after physical dissolution; that our relation to the universe is exhausted by our present sensation and consciousness,—let him believe these things without a doubt, and commit himself to them without a fear, and the difficulty which other men would feel under certain moral conditions vanishes, and it is easy to see that such opinions must result in precisely the conduct which has characterized the majority of the champions of skepticism, and of the multitudes who have surrendered themselves to their pernicious influence and degrading power.

The plain result is, that, whilst the materialist may be a bad man, without violating his strictly materialistic doctrines, whilst the Christian professor is bound, by every principle of his faith, to be consistent, pure, and beneficent, and to be all this continually, no matter how unkindly the circumstances may be, he is to despise shame and persecution, and, if need be, to sacrifice his life for his moral and spiritual convictions.

"The conclusion," as a distinguished writer has said, "is that no doctrine can be morally good which ignores morals, and no doctrine that ignores morals can be supported by men who are morally good."

DESTRUCTIVENESS OF SECULARISM.

Not only does the theory of a worldly life utterly fail to accomplish the beneficent results of which some prominent skeptics have dreamed; not only have these purely earthly considerations and speculations demonstrated their impotence and immoral tendencies in the lives and conduct of those who have been the public representatives and champions, but on the broadest scale such teachings which ignore the future life and the authority of the Christian revelation have proved destructive of all those elements which make for the peace, prosperity, and well-being of the individual, society, and the world.

When a certain class of men have declared that the "great Companion is dead," that the Christian heaven is only a myth, and a future life an empty dream; and would confine man's attention only to time, and teach constantly that in this world alone we have the genesis and the utter consummation of our existence, we can readily imagine what effect such teachings would have on the common, practical life of mankind when generally and thoroughly received.

If the theory of George Eliot and many others were true, that the pathos of a brief mortality is more calculated to move the sympathies of human hearts than the teachings of the Christian revelation respecting a future life or world, then, in this case, one of the tenderest periods of human history should have been the period of the French Revolution, when death was voted an "eternal sleep." Was human life then regarded with the deep, broad sympathy, when religion was publicly ridiculed, and the principles of the most unblushing and reckless infidelity obtained a national support? Was man's life then regarded with universal feelings of sanctity, when each morning furnished its new supply of victims for

the guillotine, and the "red rain" of human blood fell in showers all over that fair and sunny land? Whatever this theory might do in a world altogether differently constituted from the one in which we live, it is not ours to judge; but when confronted by the conditions and actualities which distinguish our present abode, it breaks down in a manner the most absolute and complete. The story of all unchristian ages and nations is on this very point one of cruelty, sadness, and woe. The records are crimsoned with human blood and atrocities, which make one shudder as we read. The Greeks and Romans and the nations of antiquity traded in human life as if it was nothing more than so much blood and bone, and its value was decided by the price it would bring at the public mart. Thousands were cruelly murdered and slain, merely to gratify an emperor's whim or furnish amusement "for a Roman holiday."

It would not be difficult to fill up pages of horrors which are sickening to contemplate, but which, almost without exception, have marked the career or history of those peoples who have been uninfluenced by the teachings of the Christian faith.

And yet, in full view of all those facts, which cannot be disputed, we are told by the apostles of materialism that human life will retain its worth undiminished; that it will lose none of its dignity, its higher aspirations, its beauty, or its poetry, when recognized to be wholly of the earth earthy. We are convinced this position is capable of a refutation of the most conclusive and overwhelming kind. The facts of ancient and modern history are utterly opposed to such a statement and cannot bear the investigation of intelligent and unprejudiced minds.

The language of Prince Bismarck on this subject is timely

and to the point; he will not be suspected of any sickly idealism or mawkish sentimentality of any kind: "It is incomprehensible to me," says the German Chancellor, in a letter to his wife, "how any human being, who thinks about himself at all, and who is ignorant or chooses to remain ignorant of God, can live under his load of self-contempt and *ennui*. . . . If I had to live now as I did then . . . I really do not know why I should not throw off this life like a dirty shirt." And as one has remarked, this was written by him in the prime of life, with every affection gratified, with the magnificent career he has since run opening unclouded before him; and he specially begs his wife, to whom the letter was addressed, not to suppose it written in a particularly dark mood, but that on the contrary, his health and spirits are good. Writing to his wife ten years later, and speaking of the brevity of life, even in the happiest case, and when prolonged to its fullest space, he says: "It would not be worth while to dress and undress if it were over with that."

"What poetry," asks one, "what art, what morality will long survive under the belief that man is only an earthworm of more differentiated protoplasm; his love and faith but atomic currents of the brain, or may be, as the French philosopher asserts, of the smaller intestines, and the power ruling all, not a God and Father, but a ponderous mill-wheel of perpetual motion, lower than himself in that it has not even a brain?"

If man is nothing more than the "apex of a pyramid" whose base is a worm; if he is but the outcome of blind, mechanical, physical force, and the helpless irresponsible victim of a cruel, iron necessity, then does he sink to a level with the animal creature around him, and such a thing as a noble, glorious freedom becomes an impossibility. To baptize him with high-sounding titles, if such teachings are true, is only a mockery of the cruelest kind. If his genesis is in some

far-off zoölogical garden, we may call him a "splendid animal," "the glorification of the brute," "the apocalypse of the beast," or the "crown and glory of the universe"; but all this would be but a poor compensation for those royal characteristics and legacies which our would-be teachers are willing to bury in the dust. When man's robe of dignity is torn into shreds, and the crown of immortality is snatched from his brow and dashed into ruins, and the theory of a brief animalism, or at best a "book-shelf immortality," is substituted in their stead, we can at once see that the effect of such a system could not but be of the most humiliating and degrading kind. Man's future becomes a thing of sadness and of gloom; the true "center of man's gravity" is no longer the larger world beyond, but the physical and bodily gratifications which the present scene may possibly supply; around his life is flung the "crape of a creedless gloom," and around his grave the darkness of a sad despair, with no hope that the eastern sky will ever redden with the fair promise of a resurrection morn. The important matter of human responsibility fares no better under teachings such as we are now reviewing. The solemn facts of man's moral freedom, and consequent accountability, are practically ignored, for he is declared to be the victim of his surroundings, and the distinctions between right and wrong are set aside, or divested of whatever force and authority they may now possess. No higher law than a mere human expediency is recognized, and all the motives, actions, and authorities by which men are to be moved and guided, are confined to the narrow arena of time, in which, for a while, they are found. By this theory of a mere earthly life, in which we are told the utmost possibilities of our existence are reached, the most cherished anticipations of the race, embraced by the noblest

of our kind, and clung to in millions of instances at great sacrifice and under life's most sorrowful and painful circumstances, are struck down into the ruin and desolation of an unending night. Tell us no longer of man's dignity and glory, but point him out to all coming time as the only bungle in creation and the very scandal of the universe itself. This utter debasement of humanity and this squandering of the "crown rights" of mankind are well illustrated by the story which one of the historians tells of a tame eagle he once saw in a butcher's shop. The royal bird, he says, "had forgotten the plains of heaven, the glories of sun and sea, and sky and storm; its plumes dragged in the ashes; and its eyes, once bathed with the light of noon, now twinkled in the kitchen fire." Sir I. F. Stephens, in "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," has truly said, "that the facts of human life are the same on any hypothesis. A belief in God, and a future state, is the only faith which scatters any rays of light over the otherwise dark sea on which we are sailing."

But the results of this materialistic teaching on public and individual morality, if widely accepted, could not fail to be of the most serious and alarming character. When the only authoritative and acknowledged standard of morals in the world is repudiated and declared to be without foundation, we can at once imagine what flood-tides of iniquity would deluge society if this standard was cancelled or set aside. The screws of man's moral nature are loosened; the gambling spirit in man, which makes him ready to toss up for his chance and to believe that something good will happen, is encouraged, and, in ten thousand instances, men under the influence of Atheism have pawned away the costly possessions of being for a momentary gratification, and have dug graves in which their once cherished hopes have been buried. Strike

from the great common mind the motives and restraints which our divine and supernatural religion presents; and vital principles which hold millions within the bounds of a moral respectability would be cancelled, and the onrolling floods of vice and iniquity would spread themselves far and wide.

The most recent, and in some respects the most striking, confirmation of the positions which this article is seeking to enforce is that which is found in the *Wall Street Journal* of New York, which appeared in the issue for January of the present year. This very remarkable and significant editorial, under the caption "Is There a Decline in Faith?" awakened such general and eager interest that this particular issue was soon exhausted and the management of the paper had the editorial copied from the files to meet the urgent demands. If so reputable a journal, devoted (as it claims) wholly to the discussion of financial and economical conditions, problems, and interests, is thus concerned for the preservation of the Christian faith in its purity as the foundation and safeguard of the business of the country, how sensitive should be the concern of those directly responsible in a matter so vital and so wide-reaching in its influence and power? As the article is of exceptional value, we give it in full.

"He who believes in a future life is a citizen of two worlds. He moves in this, but his highest thought and inspiration are fixed on the future. To such a person, what takes place here and now is not unimportant, but it is infinitely less important than what shall take place hereafter. He looks upon his life here as but a preparation for the life to come. His experiences here, whether of joy or of sorrow, are of value to him only as they enable him the better to meet the everlasting demands of the life after death. He is not indifferent to the rewards which may come in this world to industry, endeavor and opportunity, but failure, illness, poverty, abuse—what do these amount to, to a man who believes he is to enjoy the sublime privileges of eternity? He measures everything by the infinite. Wealth, luxury, power, distinction—he may not despise these, but he looks

upon them as being but temporary, mere delights that are given as tests of his character.

"Faith in eternal life smooths out every inequality and injustice of the present life under the great weight of the infinite. It makes the poor feel rich, and gives to the unfortunate a sense of heirship to the Almighty. It makes the rich feel a sense of grave responsibility and trusteeship.

"Now it is not needful for this discussion to consider whether such faith is reasonable or not. The *Wall Street Journal* has no concern with theological discussions. It takes no part for or against any creed, but it is intensely interested in the economic and political effects of any change in the thought, the habits, and the lives of men. If there has been a marked decline in religious faith, that fact must be of profound, far-reaching significance. It alters the basic conditions of civilization. It becomes a factor in the markets. It changes the standards and affects the values of things which are bought and sold. It concerns the immediate interests of those who never had such a faith almost as much as it does the lives of those who have had the faith and lost it.

"The question, therefore, is of practical, immediate, and tremendous importance to Wall Street, quite as much as any other part of the world. Has there been a decline in the faith in the future life, and if so, to what extent is this responsible for the special phenomena of our time, the eager pursuit of sudden wealth, the shameless luxury and display, the gross and corrupting extravagance, the misuse of 'swollen fortunes,' the indifference to law, the growth of graft, the abuses of great corporate power, the social unrest, the spread of demagoguery, the advances of socialism, the appeals to bitter class hatred? To find out what connection exists between a decadence in religious faith and the social unrest of our time, due, on one side, to oppressive use of financial power, and on the other, to class agitation, might well be worth an investigation by Government experts, if it were possible for the Government to enter into such an undertaking.

"Whatever may be a man's own personal beliefs, there is no one who would not prefer to do business with a person who really believes in a future life. If there are fewer men of such faith in the world, it makes a big difference, and if faith is to continue to decline, this will require new adjustments. There are certainly, on the surface, many signs of such a decline. Perhaps, if it were possible to probe deeply into the subject, it might be found that faith still abounded, but it is no longer expressed in the old way. But we are obliged to accept the surface indications. These include a falling off in church attendance, the abandonment of family worship, the giving over of Sunday, more and more, to pleasure and labor, the

separation of religious from secular education, under the stern demands of non-sectarianism, the growing up of a generation uninstructed as our fathers were in the study of the Bible, the secularization of a portion of the church itself, and its inability in a large way to gain the confidence of the laboring people. If these are really signs of a decay of religious faith, then indeed there is no more important problem before us than that of either discovering some adequate substitute for faith, or to take immediate steps to check a development that has within it the seeds of a national disaster."

Dr. J. W. Draper, of New York University, in the *Princeton Review*, for 1877, has set forth the political effects which the decline of faith in Continental Europe has brought about. He says:—

"Whence comes that black thunder cloud, Nihilism, now lowering over Eastern Europe? The most despotic of all civilized governments looks on with alarm. Whence comes that blood-red spectre, Communism, threatening Western Europe? In France they have had experience of what it would do. And Socialism in Central Europe! If it cannot have its way, it threatens revolution, civil war."

And it is a matter of undisputed history, that unchristian and unbelieving nations have always furnished the world with their "programs of misery and of blood."

And with the eclipse of faith, our noblest conceptions of the world we live in, of the Maker of that world, and of the human life are all slain and buried in one dreary grave. We are left to listen to the "dry, dead clatter of the universal machinery" around us, and it stands before us more like some huge and mighty skeleton than anything else.

"The magnificent drama of human life sinks into a puppet-show, without even a showman. We find ourselves drifting in piteous impotency over the stormy sea of time, mastless, chartless, sailless, we are driven along; man becomes a bundle of miserable contradictions; the world one gigantic paradox; the history of the race a confused and inexplicable conflict and struggle; life a troubled and

feverish dream; the world beyond a vague and dreadful fear; we are left to wander over a godless earth, and nothing seems real, even

“‘The pillared firmament is rottenness
And earth's base is built of stubble.’”

In conclusion, we adopt the remarks of a writer in the *Modern Review*, for October, 1881. This writer says:—

“There is abundant evidence to prove that however lamentably religion may have failed to raise human conduct to its ideal standard of morality, the *absence* of religion, where it has been general in any society, has been accompanied by a fearful increase of immorality. Witness the morals of the later Roman Empire, of Italy, under the first pagan influence of the Renaissance; of France, during the last half of the eighteenth century. Witness the doctrines of the Nihilists, and of all the extreme Socialists, who would abolish the family, property, and social organizations, together with God, and with unconscious logic, call for absolute lawlessness as the only complete expression of Atheistic liberty.”

ARTICLE VI.

FALSE BIOLOGY AND FATALISM.¹

BY THE REVEREND JOHN T. GULICK, SC.D.

HONOLULU, T. H.

HERBERT SPENCER rests his denial of the freedom of the human will on the biological assumption that all vital activities are predetermined by activities in the environment.² In his "Principles of Biology," sections 169 and 170, we read: "At first, changes in the amounts and combinations of external inorganic forces, astronomic, geologic, and meteorologic were the only causes of the successive changes undergone by organisms. In time, however, the action of organisms on one another became new sources of organic modifications." And again: "That there may be continuous changes in organism, there must be continuous changes in incident forces."

It is evident that if our natural powers and our present conditions are so determined by the environment that we can produce but one set of actions, then no effort on our part, either individual or collective, can in the least affect the result; for we cannot change our circumstances without acting, and our actions are already determined by our circumstances.

We now raise the question, whether the assumption on which Herbert Spencer founds his philosophy, and which has been accepted without question by many biologists, is in accord with the facts of biology.

¹ Reprinted from the *Friend* (Honolulu, T. H.), June and August, 1907.

² *Principles of Psychology*, sect. 220.

Is it true that change in the character of the selection affecting any organic group is wholly determined by change in the activities surrounding the group? Or can change in the selection be initiated and maintained through change in the organism, without any change in the environment?

External nature furnishes the means and the occasions but not the cause. Can anything be surer than that through the activities of the organism changes in its relations to the environment are often produced; and that through these changes the character of its survival is changed, and so the character of its selection? It is by virtue of its power to strive for the continuance of its life that an organism is an organism; and selection is the direct result of varying degrees of survival in the exercise of this power. We see, therefore, that the doctrine, common amongst a certain class of evolutionists, that the environment makes the organism, rests on a false assumption. One cause of this assumption has been the habit of speaking of the transforming power of selection as if it were quite distinct from the power of variation; whereas the diversity of survival, which is diversity of selection, is the direct result of the varying adaptation of the organism. The transforming power of selection is the direct result of variation and heredity, with the elimination of the less fit.

If we wish to draw a true parallel between Natural Selection and Artificial (or rational) Selection, we must consider both wild and domestic creatures as gaining opportunity for propagation by adapting themselves to the environment, the one class varying so as to be the best able to perpetuate its kind in the struggle for life among irrational creatures that are the environment, and the other class varying so as to be the most pleasing to man, and through his care and protection gaining a chance to live and propagate. The one class adapt

themselves to the natural (or irrational) environment, the other to the rational environment. *In either case change in the character of the selection may be produced through change in the organism, without any change in the environment.*

I will now refer to cases that illustrate and prove this statement.

It should be noted that Natural Selection and Sexual Selection—the two forms of selection discussed by Darwin—belong to widely different spheres of action, and, as I have elsewhere shown, there are other forms of selection of equal importance with these, arising in each of these spheres. Natural Selection is one form of Environal Selection, the changes of which are determined by changes in the natural environment. Another form of Environal Selection is Artificial Selection, the changes of which are determined by changes in the rational environment surrounding the species. A third form of Environal Selection is what I have called *Endonomic Selection*, diverse forms of which are determined by different methods of using the same environment adopted by isolated branches of the same species.

The valleys of Manoa and Nuuanu, on the island of Oahu, near Honolulu, though only about three miles apart, present a greater difference in vegetation than that found between Manoa and Kawaihoa (in the district of Waialua), which are twenty miles apart; but the divergence in the species of snails of the genus *Achatinella* occupying these valleys varies according to the number of ridges by which they are separated, and not according to the conditions to which they are exposed. The largest species of the genus are found in the adjoining valleys of Manoa and Makiki clinging to the trunks of the ohia and kukui trees while their nearest of kin in Waialua are much smaller, are of different forms and colors, and have

deserted the trunks of the larger trees to live on the lobelia and other shrubs.

Several species of birds found in North America have changed, or are now in the process of changing, their relations to the environment in such a way as to introduce themselves to new forms of selection. One is the cliff swallow, which, instead of plastering its nest against the roof of a cave or hole in a cliff, attaches it to the overhanging eaves of a house. Another is the chimney swift. We know that before the coming of Europeans these birds chose hollow trees as the appropriate places for their nests, but now most of the species have deserted the hollow trees, and established themselves in the chimneys.

The influence of habits in determining new relations to the environment is well illustrated by a colony of cats on Tarpon Island, near the mouth of the Mississippi River. One of the most decided instincts of the ordinary cat is to avoid immersion in water or any other liquid. He dislikes to wet even his feet; but there may arise conditions under which he will use his paws in drawing food out of the water. More than one has learned to help himself to cream placed in an open jar, by thrusting his paw into the liquid and then licking off what adheres. Some have learned to skim pans of milk in a similar way, and others have become adepts in fishing for gold fish kept in glass globes. These undoubted examples of the partial overcoming of their natural aversion make it easier to believe the account given by the New Orleans *Times-Democrat* concerning the Tarpon Island cats. Their separation from other families of cats has allowed of their establishing their habits of feeding on entirely new lines of tradition, for they all wade freely in the shallow waters of the beach hunting for small fish, and three or four of the bolder ones

swim off to oyster boats lying at anchor near by. This is an example of an innovation becoming a permanent habitude; and, as Captain Bosco, who owns these cats, says it is many years since they began to go into the water, we have reason to believe that a coincident form of Endonomic Selection has begun to produce a breed whose innate instincts are better adapted to this mode of life than were those of the original stock.

Returning to Sexual Selection, we find that it is one of several forms of selection arising from the relations in which the members of the same species stand to each other and which may, therefore, be classed as forms of Reflexive Selection. Sexual Selection secures between the sexual instincts of one sex and the instincts and characters of the other sex such harmony as is necessary for the sexual propagation of the group. Social Selection maintains such social instincts and related characters as are necessary for the prosperity of the group. Social habits in a great measure determine the food and clothing of a community, and thus deeply affect the conditions of survival. The degree of exposure to which the young are habitually subjected is also largely determined by social custom, and so the innate endowments of those that survive. In many beasts and birds recognition marks are of great importance; and the disadvantage coming to those deficient in these characters results in Social Selection.

A third form of Reflexive Selection is what I have called *Filio-parental Selection*, which maintains coördination between the powers and characters of parents, and the size, number, form, and instincts of the young. How the power of giving suck and the corresponding instinct for sucking were first developed it may be impossible to tell; but it is evident that, having once been established as the method of

sustentation for the young of mammals, any mother lacking the power of giving suck, and any young lacking the instinct for sucking, would in all probability fail of leaving descent. The death at birth of children with excessively large heads, as also the failure of a mother with a contracted pelvis to produce living children, are examples of filio-parental selection.

There are several other forms of Reflexive Selection, but the only one that we can take time to consider is *Institutional Selection*. Institutional Selection is due to the suppression of human reproduction in certain cases, and the favoring of it in other cases, by means of ecclesiastical, military, commercial, sanitary, and penal institutions. It is of great interest to the student of social problems, for it shows how even the inherited powers of the civilized races of mankind are being constantly molded by their institutions, and the forms of social organization that prevail.

In all divergent evolution of racial characters, segregate generation (that is, the generation of like with like) has been a fundamental condition. It is also at present a fundamental condition in the very structure of the organic world; for without Segregate Generation, races, species, genera, and the higher groups could not continue to exist: even if they were independently created.

In every case where a sexually propagating species becomes divided into several distinct races, we find isolation (i. e. the prevention of free crossing) between the races, with inter-generation within each race, and each race showing separate powers of variation and heredity. This initial segregation having once been established, intensive segregation is sure to be introduced and carried forward from generation to generation, even when the conditions lying outside of each group are the same; for the isolated groups will in time adopt different

methods of using the environment, and so subject themselves to different forms of selection. Divergent forms of Reflexive Selection will also arise bringing intensified segregation and increasing divergence in the characters of each group.

We will now briefly consider the evolution of acquired characters; and, for the sake of brevity, I will at the same time refer to some of the ways in which these acquired characters, with their organized habitudes and customs, become controlling factors in the racial evolution of the same groups. But, that there may be no misapprehension, I wish to have it carefully noted that the influence of acquired characters which I am here considering is entirely independent of any direct modification of inheritance in the young through acquired characters gained by the continued practice of the parents. Whether there is any such direct influence has long been discussed, and the prevailing opinion is that it has been disproved; but, whatever the truth on that point may be, the influence of acquired characters, through their control of the forms of selection, must be recognized as of commanding importance in many of the higher animals and especially in man. This influence operates: (1) by partially setting aside a form of selection; (2) by wholly setting aside some form of selection; or (3) by establishing a new form. Acquired characters by partially setting aside a form of selection arising from changes that would otherwise limit the range of the species, may give time for many generations to arise with successive variations that in their turn more or less fully meet the new conditions, and thus lead to a new form of Natural Selection, and the establishing of a new race.

As an illustration let us consider the case of the Eskimo race of the Arctic regions. If we could follow their ancestry back to remote ages, there is every reason to believe that we

should find a stage in which they were naked savages, living in a warm climate, with but little knowledge of houses, clothing, or fire. It may be a matter of debate whether they reached the northern regions in a period when the climate was a continuous summer, or whether their approach required an increasing fight with cold weather as they went north; but, in either case, they could not have established themselves in these regions where they now are, without the several arts by which man protects himself from the cold. It is therefore evident that these arts were part of the equipment that has enabled them to remain for countless generations in these cold regions, till their inherited constitution has become very different from that of tropical man. F. A. Cook, ethnologist of the first Peary North Greenland Expedition, writing of the Eskimo, states that "the muscular outlines of the body are nearly obliterated from the fact that they have immediately beneath the skin a layer of blubber, or areolar tissue, which protects them against extreme cold."¹

We find that accommodation with habitudinal segregation fills a sphere of importance in the evolution of animals according to the degree of their mental endowments. In studying the evolution of the higher animals it is, therefore, necessary to consider the molding of accommodations by election as well as the molding of adaptations by selection.

In the case of the Eskimo we have an illustration of the setting aside, or prevention, of Natural Selection sufficient to preserve the group from destruction; for Natural Selection in such a case is the elimination of the unfit, and as none were capable of surviving without the aid of clothing and houses, Natural Selection unchecked by these arts would have been the elimination of all. The prevention of Natural Selection

¹ Quoted in Wright and Upham's *Greenland Icefields*, p. 136.

was, however, not complete; and in the end we find a race of men with innate characters protecting them in a considerable degree from the destructive effects of the low temperature.

Let us now consider cases in which Natural Selection in regard to certain endowments has been entirely set aside by acquired characters; and other cases in which new forms of selection have, at the same time, been introduced. From the time of the earliest mammals till very recent times every mammalian mother that failed to give milk to her young also failed of raising her young, and the propagation of a stock seriously deficient in this respect was prevented by Filio-parental Selection. Amongst human mothers there are, however, a few who are deficient in the power of giving suck, and, in civilized races, the provision for the young of such mothers is so complete that they are placed at no disadvantage. There is, therefore, reason to believe that the power of mothers to give suck is being gradually diminished by the setting aside of this long-established form of Filio-parental Selection. We may even begin to wonder whether this is not the first step toward the production of a variety of the human species in which this power will be comparatively obsolete.

Another example of a similar kind is the deterioration of the power of sight in the more civilized races of man. I believe it is fully recognized that the proportion of individuals with defective sight is much greater in civilized than in savage races.

Is there any reason to doubt that the difference is due to the fact, that, for many generations, savages with deficient sight have had less opportunity for leaving descendants, than have individuals with the same deficiency belonging to civilized races?

Degeneration of important powers has also occurred in many animals that have become parasitic, or have learned to

shift the responsibility of raising their young onto other species. The old-world cuckoo has entirely lost the instincts that would lead it to build its own nests and hatch its own eggs. In the eastern part of the United States of America the black-billed cuckoo and the yellow-billed cuckoo have started on a course that will probably lead to the extinction of both species, unless they succeed in finding some alien species on which the labor of raising their young may be imposed. There are now shirking individuals who lay their eggs in the nests of other birds, either of their own species or of the allied species, and thus the instinct for faithful service is being lowered from generation to generation.

When public attention has been turned to the danger of degeneration that threatens mankind through the setting aside of certain forms of long-established selection, the remedy will not be found in restoring the conditions of savage life, in which the deaf and the blind are eliminated by starvation; but rather by establishing new forms of institutional and prudential selection. The marriage of those who are specially liable to have defective offspring may thus be prevented.¹

The illustrations I have presented, show conclusively that in many ways old forms of selection may be set aside and new forms introduced, without reference to any change in the activities outside of the species. If even the snails are capable of dealing with the same environment in different ways, how much more may we expect of mankind? The voices of science, of philosophy, and of religion, appeal to us both as individuals and as communities, saying, in the words of Paul, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you."

¹ The influence of acquired habits on the inherited characters of a group is fully discussed in my work on "Evolution, Racial and Habitudinal," published by the Carnegie Institute of Washington.

ARTICLE VII.

NOTES.

THE POVERTY AND VICE OF LONDON.

THE eccentric W. H. H. Murray once forcibly remarked that "if the good people were removed out of any great city it would leave hell; whereas, were the bad to be removed and the good left, the result would be heaven." All large cities afford the conditions which most severely test human character and develop the extremes both of evil and of good. London, being the largest city in the world, and especially in the Christian world, illustrates this truth in extreme degree.

The slums of London are not by any means confined to the East End. One has to go but a little way from any of the fashionable streets to find a congested population living on the very border of despair. The extent of poverty in London is beyond comprehension; and it does not grow less in times of business prosperity. While the last five years have seen an unprecedented boom in British export trade, they have also witnessed an unprecedented growth of pauperism in London. According to the returns just issued by the Local Government Board, it appears that there were 3,000 more paupers at the end of 1907 than there were one year before, while 46,000 more had been in receipt of relief at the beginning of this winter than had demanded help one year ago. The total number receiving temporary help at the opening of this winter was 800,101. The total amount expended by the City for the relief of the poor during the last half year, aside from that furnished by private charity, amounted to \$3,825,000.

According to statistics carefully gathered, two-thirds of this poverty is directly traceable to the use of alcoholic beverages, which nearly every grocer sells freely in sealed packages.

A large number of the sub-post-offices are located in such groceries. Saloons (or "public houses" as they are called in England) abound in every part of the city, and are patronized by men, women, and children. According to a discourse preached in one of the most fashionable and largely attended churches of the established order, it had been ascertained that two public houses near by were visited between 4 P.M. and 11 P.M., the previous Saturday, by a crowd of men, women, and children numbering 1,900, of whom 600 were children. Nothing in London oppresses an American more sadly than to see the numbers of poor women who openly patronize the saloons. Upon the opening of the bars in the morning, dozens of women may be seen waiting to be served; and at almost any time of day women with children in arms may be seen going in and out of these demoralizing centers of influence.

At the same time it should be said that every form of activity tending to promote temperance is in operation in the City and throughout the Kingdom, and is supported by the adherents of all religious denominations. As a consequence of this work it is generally believed that there has been a great improvement among the middle classes. But such legal methods for restricting the sale of alcoholic beverages as are effectually used in the United States are practically unknown in England. The public houses of the Kingdom are regarded as having a vested right in the profits derived from their licensed privilege to sell, so that it is thought that if the privilege were taken away, the proprietors could claim from the State an indemnity for their loss. Moreover, drinks are generally served in the public houses by barmaids—a custom which is pretty generally supposed to be demoralizing in its tendency. But every effort to change this custom is met by a great outcry against the hardship of depriving 100,000 barmaids of the only means of subsistence in which they have been trained to earn their livelihood.

The extent to which the liquor traffic is imbedded in the financial interests of the country was strikingly exemplified

in the effect of the Ministerial bill just presented for the further regulation and diminution of public houses. The bill proposes to reduce the number of licensed houses by 30,000 in fourteen years. On the day following the introduction of this bill, the market value of stocks secured by the liquor traffic shrank \$160,000,000, and well nigh produced a financial panic.

A bill is now before Parliament to grant "local option" to wards and municipalities in the matter of licensing saloons. But the English Government is so much more centralized than our own, that it will probably be some time before public sentiment will be educated up to the point of passing such a measure. The doctrine of States' rights in America and the traditional authority of the New England "town-meeting" have familiarized the citizens of the United States with the principle of local option in general, so that its application in restraint of the use of strong drink does not seem strange. In England, moreover, the principle seems, as yet, subversive of good order and hazardous to the rights of the individual who chances to be unpopular in his own community. Nevertheless, a modified acceptance of the principle seems to be but a question of time. Among others who have petitioned for the passage of the present bill are 1,900 of the clergymen of the Church of England.

If London is full of intemperance and poverty, it is also full of institutions endeavoring to counteract these evils. Hospitals, orphanages, settlements, and missions are found in all parts of the City, and none of them fail of receiving liberal support. The late Lord Mayor signalized his retirement from office by raising \$1,000,000 to equip a hospital for crippled children. Sums poured in from rich and poor alike until considerably more was received than he had asked for. There are hospitals for every class of patients and for all classes.

General Booth of the Salvation Army is one of the "lions" of the Kingdom. Oxford confers upon him a degree. When he is ill in America the papers of all classes note with great

minuteness the stages of his recovery to health. In short, he is the kind of man that the King delights to honor. His efforts to induce the poor of the cities to go out and live upon small holdings in the country are measurably successful, and are regarded as worthy of imitation by Parliament itself. Through his efforts large numbers have been helped to find homes in Canada. The drawback is, that only the best and most vigorous of London's poor can be drawn into the country, or will be allowed to enter Canada, and so some of the worst aspects of London's poverty are intensified by these laudable efforts towards relief.

But the Salvation Army is by no means the chief instrumentality at work for the relief of poverty and the prevention of vice in London. There are "settlements" without number where cultivated men and women are living in close contact with the unfortunate classes and exemplifying in their lives and in all their efforts the Christian spirit in the most effective manner. We have heard so much of Toynbee Hall that many have been led to suppose that that was the chief, if not the only, work of its sort. But the Oxford Settlement in Bethnal Green is far larger. In that section of the city thirty Oxford students are in continual residence, maintaining at seven different centers work for the poorer classes, of the most effective kind; while in the same district an equal number of centers of influence among women are kept in operation by their devoted sisters of the Church of England.

In connection, also, with missions of the most influential churches of the established order, there is an organization of the Church Army, in which the curates go out with others into the highways and the hedges to draw the wayward within the circle of good and helpful influences. Almost every Dissenting church also has its mission schools and its deaconesses and lay helpers who are making inroads upon the realms of evil. One flourishing Quaker meeting is composed almost entirely of members who have been brought in through the efforts of one of their missions. The Bedford Institute, established fifty years ago for the advancement of

the poor of the Spitalfields neighborhood by a wealthy Quaker early associated with Elizabeth Fry, has efficient branches in several other parts of the city also. Then there are model self-supporting lodging-houses, where, for a few cents, sober men by the thousand can get lodging, bath, and a chance to cook a breakfast. And there are large apartment-houses, built by Peabody, and others who have followed his example, where the respectable poor are comfortably and neatly housed on very reasonable terms. The municipality also has gone farther than some feel is wise in providing model apartment-houses at low rates of rental.

And yet, as said at the beginning, the hopeless poor of London increase both actually and relatively. The problem certainly is one which it is fearful to contemplate, and one does not wonder to find Socialism prevailing to an increasing extent among those who are most actively engaged in humanitarian efforts. The good deaconesses who are day by day visiting the abodes of wretchedness in Whitechapel cry out in their anguish, "Why cannot something be done to equalize the conditions of people in this great city?" Why should so many children be compelled to go to school in the winter months shoeless and without breakfast? A company of 300 unemployed from one section of the city call upon their compatriot John Burns, now in the Cabinet, and ask, "Why is it that 5,000 men in our section of the city are, in these prosperous times, out of employment?"

It is the existence of the great army of the unemployed which gives strength to the powerful movement in favor of a protective tariff which is now going on. By protecting various industries it is hoped to stimulate certain lines of business, and so increase the demand for home labor. Singularly enough, it is the Conservative party which is urging the adoption of a protective tariff, and this is called "Tariff Reform." But the labor leaders are still found in favor of free trade, believing, as they do, that a protective tariff would raise the cost of living, and so, while helping the few, would overburden the many who are striving for a livelihood.

One of the most touching appeals for charity, in the City this winter, has been to raise money to buy shoes for shoeless children attending the public schools. Another equally pitious appeal for charity has been to provide dinners for the children who have come to school without breakfast. "Why," it is asked, "should not all this be done by the state; and why should not the state provide pensions for all the aged?"

The pressure to have the state buy shoes for the shoeless, and food for hungry children and old people indiscriminately, is very strong and just now is growing in strength. So far, indeed, has Parliament gone in this direction that it is instituting methods by which the land of the great estates is to be forcibly divided into parcels and sold to small holders.

But, properly enough, the wiser ones hesitate at the adoption of measures which will weaken parental responsibility for the support of children, and remove the main incentive for economy and thrift in middle life, and tend to break down the respect for private property which has been the mainspring of modern industrial progress. Whether 'tis wise to fly from the "ills we have," "to others," which may be far more serious, "that we know not of," is a question which cannot be answered upon the spur of the moment. It is doubtless best that movement in this direction should be slow and tentative. Apparently there is a near limit, though ill-defined, to the profitable absorption by the state of private responsibilities and enterprises. On the whole, an orphanage cannot be so good as a home. Parental responsibility cannot be lightly thrown upon the state without disastrous results. In general, it must be best for the individual to bear in his youth the burden of preparation for old age.

Even in the matter of municipal ownership of public utilities, less advantage has been gained than was to have been expected. Three years ago the London City Council invested in a number of steamboats to run on the river Thames. After having lost \$700,000 in the venture, their boats are now offered for sale. They thereby save a loss of \$40,000 per year in running expenses, besides that from the further

deterioration of their property. Likewise the business calculation of the City Council in straightening old streets and opening new has not been justified by the results. Great spaces which have been cleared of old buildings are not so greedily bought up by capitalists as was expected. The tramways of one large city, at least, have been made to appear profitable for a few years simply by manipulating the accounts so as to conceal the deterioration of the plant. The municipality, with its changing officials, cannot secure the high grade of service obtained by private parties interested in their own property.

Socialism as a theory is sure to be discredited by the weakness and perversity of the human agents by which it is carried into effect. In presence of the terrific evils which seem to be the offspring of our material civilization, one cannot help sympathizing with those disappointed philanthropists who in very desperation would be willing to venture upon almost any experiment that would give hope of relief. But we must remember that even an All-wise Creator respects the freedom of the human will, and does not force men to be virtuous. It would seem, therefore, the part of wisdom for us to build up our hope of the future regeneration of the world by redoubling the moral influences set in motion by Him who freely confessed that equality was not the goal of human existence, but that, from one cause or another, the poor we should always have with us.

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT.

LONDON, ENGLAND, March 4, 1908.

USE AND ABUSE OF APOLOGETICS.¹

I NEVER placed apologetics in the foreground. The best generals always taught that in a severe war one perishes as soon as he stands on the defensive alone. He can expect success only when he boldly ventures to attack the enemy.

When in 1868, coming from my quiet village of Guelder, I became, in Utrecht, acquainted for the first time with our

¹[Introduction to the Dutch Edition of Professor Wright's "Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History."]

most prominent apologists, the beliefs which they held and the positions which they were maintaining did not at all realize my expectations. There was nothing in their beliefs to inspire courage or to arouse hope of victory or any desire for aggressive action, but rather to create anxiety lest we lose here an outwork and there a trench, and hence a desire to retreat to the middle of the fortification in order not to be threatened with complete defeat.

This vexed and troubled me so that I did not feel the least inclination to devote my youthful strength to the service of such a kind of warfare. By such endless apologetic and such constant attitude of defense the assailants were permitted to determine the entire plan of battle and to fix upon the vulnerable points of attack, and the apologists were compelled to follow. The apologists had no strategic scheme at all. They always were obliged to take the worst positions which their antagonists had selected for them. The result was, of course, that they lost ground at every move and abandoned what in the beginning they had endeavored to defend. Gradually the ground to defend became smaller and the phalanxes of the besiegers became more solid and bold. A great part of all that was sacred to believers was in that way always made to hang upon a thorny dispute over a single verse. When a certain book appeared it seemed that in answering it they had at least put in security this or that sacred fact; but when after three months another had appeared which overturned the erected timber work, our apologists were perplexed.

When Easter was coming on in 1870 one was doubtful whether Jesus really had risen or still remained in his grave. It was all uncertain. And the worst of it was that our believing apologists would not say this to everybody. They tried to arrange that no one should observe it, and were fearful lest the congregations should be conscious of the perplexity. Instead of deriving courage, strength, and animation from the faith of the church, the apologists day by day became accustomed to the experience of cherishing simultaneously two divergent beliefs, the one to be put before the

congregation, and the other to be nursed in the privacy of their own studies.

Some of them could not bear to do this, and endeavored to adjust matters in a different manner. They laid a new philosophical foundation to support the belief of the church, and then erected upon it their own subjective scheme which they presented to the congregation. What met with the approbation of this clique was called "the belief of the church." It was this philosophical theology, cast in forms of their own creation, which they entitled "The Confession of the Church of Christ," so it was that dogma after dogma tumbled, and Holy Writ was metamorphosed into a collection of books out of which came a more sacred spirit. But you could not rely on the Holy Writ itself.

Very soon I felt that neither this apologetic nor this philosophical theology could give back to Christians their old courage by confession, their former strength of conviction, their strong faith. The strength of the first congregation of Christians depended upon their testimony to facts, upon the confession of their sacred convictions before everybody, even their most violent opposers. Did the church believe these facts or did it not? If not, then neither scientific apologetic nor philosophic enveloping of the truth could make the Christian movement an authority in the world. But if the church believes the facts, the strength of the confession based on this belief should show itself. Only a fresh and inspired conviction can give this lost faith back to us. And this is what has happened. We need to compare the Christian movement of the present time only with that of 1870, to see clearly the wonderful change that was the result of it. One does not now need to hide himself, but may go into the public highway of life and determine his course for himself. One does not now need to argue about his belief, but merely to show it, and all opposers feel that in that way there comes a spiritual force which they have no means of opposing.

The conclusion must not be drawn from this that later on, and in their own field, the apologists will not acquire the

right of joining in the discussion; provided that we first had conquered our free position and are standing no more exhausted and out of breath, but fresh and vigorous, on ground of our own choosing. Having reached such a position, we are compelled to go back and clear the ground behind us.

Among those who have made themselves ready for the contest, we find Dr. G. Frederick Wright of Oberlin, in Ohio, one of the middle in the United States of America. Dr. Wright is a clear-headed man: what he writes runs smoothly and is pellucid. But he is principally versed in natural philosophy, and has acquired the right to put in his word in this part of science. In proof of this I need only refer to his works, "The Ice Age in North America," "Man and the Glacial Period," "The Icefields of Greenland, and Life in the North Atlantic," and last but not least his "Asiatic Russia," etc. These titles show that Dr. Wright did not study these problems of nature as something of little consequence, but that he made a special study of them. Nor did he squander his strength upon minute details, but concentrated it upon a definite line of investigation. On this account one cannot help trusting him. He does not wander from the subject in hand, but penetrates to the vital part of the question laid before him, and shows that he is an authority in what he has undertaken. Although he often tires you by giving particulars which for abundance you would like to pass over, you cannot but acknowledge but that he strengthens his argument by this study of details.

When at the close of 1906 there appeared a new work of his, "Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History," and it reached our country, I immediately had the desire to make his work accessible to the masses by translating it into the Dutch; I was the more ready to do this because in this work Dr. Wright has prefaced his detailed observations by a general treatment of the trustworthiness of the history, maintaining the high character of the evidence supporting the common belief concerning the Scriptures, against the wildness and conceit of the critics. The criticism at present prevalent

in Holland which demolishes the history is the consequence of a high presumptuous individuality which forgets entirely that human society can exist advantageously only by the maintenance of the foundations of confidence.

Being too busy to translate the work myself, I ventured to request my friend Dr. Oranje to charge himself with this quiet work. Incapable of ministering to a congregation in their public meetings, in consequence of a painful disease, I thought it possible that he might like to serve the church in this quite different manner. It seemed that I was not mistaken. Scarcely had he read the work than he declared with enthusiasm that he was quite willing to translate it for the Dutch Christians, and the reader when studying it will observe the great care with which he carried out his undertaking.¹

I hope no one will be discouraged when reading the details which are occasionally very profound. The tendency is not to bring us back again to the still forbidden path of the apologetic, but to show what could be said to defend that which is left to us when the fight *pro ares et focis* was over.

It is hoped that no offense will be taken at the attempt of Dr. Wright to make clear the passing of the Jews through the Red Sea, and through the Jordan, by invoking the aid of irregular operations of nature. The belief in God's wonderful might does not require that in explanation of the wonders we should exclude the operations of nature which would have taken place in any event.

When I say that, even if Ahab and Elijah had not existed, a fire would still have fallen down at the same moment and on the same place where Elijah's sacrifice was offered, I do not say that it was not a wonder. The objective as well as the subjective wonder exists. The objective wonder is the falling down of the fire just on the same place and at the same moment of the historical event. The subjective wonder is that Elijah without knowing anything of the position of affairs in nature dared supplicate for it and had faith to believe that the fire would come.

¹ [We regret to say that, greatly to the loss of the Christian public, Dr. Oranje died soon after completing this work.]

In this way Dr. Wright writes about some of the great wonders in the history of Israel. I dare not say that he always has taken the right view of what happened, but even if in a single instance he might be mistaken I still praise his endeavors to connect wonders in the history with the course of the operations of nature. That his own belief in the wonders does not waver, he states on more than one page.

KUYPER.

THE HAGUE, September 30, 1907.

THEOLOGICAL UNREST IN ENGLAND.

HETERODOX tendencies have become so strong in England, especially under the lead of Rev. R. J. Campbell, that a formidable body of the leaders of the Congregational churches have felt called upon to issue the following statement of doctrine :—

“As men who have been called to the representative post of chairmen of the Union, or as heads of Congregational colleges, we think, in the theological unrest which has invaded the churches, that good may result from making a brief statement of some things, most surely believed among us, which require at the present time emphatic affirmation.

“Our hope is that the statement may not only help those who within our own borders are disturbed by current controversies, but also assure our fellow Christians of other Communions that we hold fast ‘the faith once for all delivered to the saints.’ At the same time we are eager, in the interests of a progressive evangelical theology, to receive all new light and truth which may break forth from the Word.

“1. We believe in the Personality of God the Father, transcendent as Maker and Ruler of all things, and yet, through His eternal Spirit, immanent in the world, and particularly in man and his history.

“2. We believe that sin, so far from being necessary to man's development, is, as a distrust of God and disobedience to Him, a perversion of the moral and religious nature which, apart from redemption, would involve man in ruin.

“3. We believe that Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, came into the world to reveal the holy love and grace of God, and to redeem man by the sacrifice of Himself once for all upon the Cross for the sin of the world, so conveying to the individual believer the Divine pardon.

"4. We believe that this pardon is appropriated by faith in Jesus Christ, and that by this faith the Holy Spirit, producing union with the living Lord, regenerates human nature to eternal life.

"5. We believe that the regenerate are the true Church to which, among other sacred obligations, is committed the task of transforming the world, morally and socially, into the Kingdom of God.

"6. We believe that the Bible is God's Book, because it enshrines the divine revelation culminating in the historic coming of Christ, His life, death, and resurrection, and the Gospel therein contained.

"7. We believe that all truth is to be received as from God, and that the apparent conflict between science and religion not only can be adjusted, but is at the present time approaching a reconciliation.

"These in our judgment are the points which just now require emphasis.

"Fervently praying for light, for loyalty to truth, and for unfailing charity, we remain,

"Yours faithfully in Christ,

"W. F. ADENEY.

"GEO. S. BARRETT.

"CHAS. CHAPMAN.

"J. COMPTON-RICKETT.

"W. CUTHBERTSON.

"A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

"P. T. FORSYTH.

"ALFRED E. GARVIE.

"A. GOODRICH.

"E. GRIFFITH-JONES.

"ROBT. F. HORTON.

"J. H. JOWETT.

"D. L. RITCHIE.

"J. GUINNESS ROGERS.

"ALFRED ROWLAND.

"CALEB SCOTT.

"ALBERT SPICER.

"H. ARNOLD THOMAS.

"R. W. THOMPSON.

"O. O. WHITEHOUSE."

This brought an immediate response from Mr. Campbell, who perceived at once against whom it was directed. At his lecture the day after, he said:—

"This morning there appears in the Press a manifesto, signed by the chairman and a number of distinguished ex-chairmen of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, and also heads of theological colleges. The avowed object of this pronouncement is to allay the present 'theological unrest' in the churches. In this respect it was the counterpart of the Papal Encyclical recently issued against the Modernists, and will prove equally futile.

"The movement against which it is directed cannot be crushed by any such ex-cathedra utterance. Some of the gentlemen who have signed this manifesto have previously tried, after the most approved methods of the Church of Rome, what violent personal abuse could

do; they are even now trying what practical excommunication can do. But they cannot allay the unrest they deplore, for it is of God. It is a shaking of the dry bones in the valley of death. It is the resurgence of faith. It is the revival of Christianity. Great is truth, and it shall prevail."

Later, in an open letter, he says :—

"The general attitude of the controlling official element in the churches is now so plainly hostile to the movement expressed in the New Theology that something will have to be done to safeguard and direct the aspirations of those who have openly professed their adherence to it. Steps have already been taken in various localities by the young people themselves to secure some form of Christian fellowship on the wider lines. This movement is so spontaneous, so virile, and so evidently inspired of God, that I can no longer refrain from acceding to the requests of those who wish me to provide a general center and an active propaganda for it. This will be done without delay.

"Leaders of the New Theology movement will be called together as soon as possible and asked to contribute advice and assistance. An attempt will be made to encourage the formation of local groups or associations of an inter-denominational character which can be federated with a center in London. The wider the basis of membership can be made the better. The theological cannot be separated from the sociological aspect of the movement. The New Theology is simply and solely the Gospel of the Kingdom of God. We may as well begin, therefore, by asserting this firmly and uncompromisingly, and wait for further results."

Simultaneously the situation was so ably discussed in the *Daily Telegraph* (March 4) by "Oxonienis" that it is worthy of permanent preservation. We are permitted to give it entire.

"A singular importance attaches to the manifesto which was addressed the other day to the Congregational Churches in England and Wales. It is issued in the names of the heads of Congregational Colleges and Chairmen of the Union, and therefore possesses all the authority of a creed as understood by those whom we class vaguely under the general name of Dissenters. A great deal has been said about the 'Nonconformist conscience,' sometimes in praise, sometimes in derision; but we at last know what the Nonconformist conscience ordains, although it must be confessed that some of the

clauses are sufficiently vague to cover a considerable divergence in opinion. But the interesting point is that at last those who have always objected to dogmas are themselves forced to issue dogmas. The Congregational body exists as a protest against the formularies of the Anglican Church, and now, in its turn, it has had to crystallise its views into a more or less definite creed, after the pattern of those Synods of bishops who met in the early centuries of the Christian era. That is in itself a startling fact, even though it must be admitted that it is due to an entirely natural process. The instinct of the liberal mind is always to protest against dogma, and a very large amount of what we call religious reform has proceeded from this revolutionary spirit. Then comes a time when the reformers themselves discover that their principles are stretched beyond their own cognisance or sanction. Some person, or some body of persons, has, to use a convenient vulgarism, 'gone one better' than they have. So the former liberals become conservatives, and intrench their position against the attacks of an adversary, who, nevertheless, is bred out of their own camp. The process of fortification is always the same—the production of a confession of faith, a series of articles enjoined upon the faithful as the very conditions of their membership, and then we are face to face with the central difficulty. To believe is relatively an easy matter, at all events for certain temperaments; but to formulate one's belief is the not easy task of supplying a reasonable basis for an emotion, of providing a logical structure for that which in its primary essence is not understood, but felt.

"CREEDS AND CONFESSIONS.

"There have been a number of confessions of faith in the history of the world, and they have all risen from much the same causes. There was, of course, no creed, in any definite sense of the word, in the early Christian Church. Indeed, it is not till a much later age, the age of Irenæus and Tertullian (175 to 200) that we meet with any definite summaries of belief. But, of course, we must go a great deal later than this before we reach a formularised programme of articles of faith. As every one knows, the first was what we call the Nicene Creed, dating from the early part of the fourth century, a creed which is especially dear to the Eastern Churches. The so-called Apostles' Creed, which the Western Churches adopted, is considerably later. And, last of all, at the very end of the eighth century, we have the Athanasian Creed. The reason for these successive promulgations is the existence of heresy, or else general conditions of religious disturbance and upheaval, such as are likely to upset the faith of the elect. The Nicene Creed, due to a large extent to the initiative of Constantine, was directly aimed against the Arian heresy, and most people are aware of those subtle distinctions and

interminable wranglings engaged in by the Council of Nicæa on the question whether the Second Person in the Trinity was or was not of the same substance as the Father. It was natural for a later age to imagine that the Apostles' Creed was due to the Apostles themselves, each of the several articles being contributed by a single Apostle. But though the Creed itself may have been in existence from the end of the fourth century, there is no historical evidence of its reception until about the middle of the eighth century, a notable characteristic being the doctrines of the descent of Christ into hell, and the communion of saints. In the case of the Athanasian Creed, we have a very wilful perversion of history in the title. Matthew Arnold said that the Creed was due to the Church being for the nonce in a bad temper. As a matter of fact, it was the response of the Christian consciousness in the age immediately following that of Charlemagne; and the imposture, such as it was, which may or may not have taken place with the concurrence of the heads of the Church, was the ascription of so elaborate and detailed an enunciation of the Trinitarian faith to a father of the Church of the fourth century, who had been at least four hundred years in his grave. Perhaps I need hardly refer to the later confessions, which have been especially plentiful in the Reformed Church. The Confession of Augsburg, in 1530, is one of the earliest of these. It expresses with clearness and brevity the doctrine and position of the Lutheran Church. The Confession of Augsburg was answered on the part of the Roman Catholic Communion by the Council of Trent, at the end of 1545. And if we pass over a series of efforts of the Reformed churches from the middle of the sixteenth century onward, we arrive at last to the two definite confessions, the Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession. The Thirty-nine Articles were originally ten in 1536, then forty-two in 1552, and finally thirty-nine between 1562 and 1571. The Westminster document was the result of the great Puritan agitation in the seventeenth century, and obtained its position of authority in 1690, when Presbyterianism was finally established in Scotland.

“THE NEW THEOLOGY.

“Between the last-mentioned date and the manifesto which was published the other day we know of hardly any document professing to be of the same unique importance. As has been already hinted, the Nonconformist body is in a somewhat peculiar position in reference to the promulgation of definite creeds. Primarily arising from a certain spirit of Antinomianism, or at all events a dislike of accurately-defined dogmas, the Congregational churches at the present day find themselves menaced by a movement which, in their opinion, threatens their position and authority. Matters have been brought

to a head by what is known as the New Theology; and perhaps no single individual has been more the cause of the new confession of faith than the Rev. R. J. Campbell. His recent books form a most illustrative example of what, from one point of view, we might call extreme Antinomianism, or, from another point of view, exceedingly liberal and enlightened thought. He treats with the greatest freedom not only the ordinarily accepted Christian doctrines, but the Holy Scriptures, and especially the New Testament. He imagines, for instance, that the Founder of our faith was, above all, a social reformer. He was, indeed, in Mr. Campbell's view, a precursor of that Socialism which is held to be the next step in our political development. 'The Kingdom of Heaven' of which Christ spoke was not, in Mr. Campbell's opinion, something transcendental, and removed from the conditions of ordinary time and space, but a new social order, which both Christ and His Apostles believed to be capable of formation within a limited period upon the earth. Other 'obiter dicta' of Mr. Campbell may be passed over, in view of the importance of the main position. There are, for instance, certain opinions which he holds with regard to the Meaning of Sin, the Existence of Evil, the Divinity of Christ, the True Meaning of Atonement, and the Doctrine of Immortality, which find various and not always consistent expression in his latest work, 'Christianity and the Social Order.' But the main point is that Christianity is Socialism, and Socialism is Christianity. And here is involved an especial danger, not only for those who dislike the mixing up of politics and religion, but also for those Congregationalists who believe that the sayings of Christ were opposed to Socialistic tenets. Modern Socialism, at all events, in the mouth of some of its exponents, has something to say about the family, about the sanctity of marriage, about the religious consciousness, together with all that it contains and enforces, which it is more than a little difficult to deduce from the language of the Gospels. Moreover—and that is, after all, a point of capital significance—Christianity has hitherto been held to connote a belief in the Divinity of Christ, and anything that throws doubt upon this proposition, anything which seems to say, in the language of Mr. Campbell, that the Founder of our religion was only a teacher in the sense in which the term is applied to other ethical reformers of the world, strikes a vital blow at the very meaning of religion as understood by the Congregational body.

"AMBIGUITY OF DOGMAS.

"This is the origin of the latest Confession of faith, which, however we like to phrase it, is directed against 'freedom,' as the New Theology understands it. Well, it must be confessed that it is an exceedingly difficult task for the Congregational Churches to attempt.

In the first place, those who object to creeds have found it necessary to promulgate a creed; those who dislike formularies have been forced to indite certain formularies of their own. And, in the second place, the Churches which sprang from the principle of freedom have to anathematize a larger illustration and evolution of that very freedom which they were the first to recommend. The difficulty of their position meets us in one of the earliest paragraphs of the Confession. The signatories assert that they hold fast 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints.' The synods of bishops could not do more. 'At the same time,' they continue, 'we are eager, in the interests of a progressive evangelical theology, to receive all new light and truth which may break forth from the Word.' Or, again, 'We believe that all truth is to be received as from God, and that the apparent conflict between science and religion not only can be adjusted, but is at the present time approaching a reconciliation.' There is no little ambiguity about statements like these. With one hand you retain your hold on the faith once delivered to the saints, while you hold out the other hand to enlightened students, who proceed on assumptions diametrically opposed to those of the Early Fathers. Even Mr. Campbell may find a refuge for his much-criticised doctrines in the ample harbourage afforded by such concessions to modern thought. And we notice besides that in the seven articles of the new creed the omissions are quite as significant as the points which are retained. The first two propositions depend for their very meaning on a theory of the formation of the world and the relation of the Creator to it, which is nowhere expounded. If we lay stress on a phrase like 'the Eternal Spirit immanent in the world,' we get to Pantheism. If we separate the Author of the Universe from the Universe He has made, we are in danger of falling into Manichæism. Sin can only be understood in relation to the doctrine of Evil; but, of course, in such a confession as this the latter cannot be explained. Those who sign the document are very anxious, evidently, to avoid any reference to Socialism, and therefore do not define with any accuracy the meaning of such phrases as 'the Kingdom of Heaven.' The Divinity of the Second Member of the Trinity is far more explicitly stated in the Nicene Creed than it is in the latest Confession of Faith, while the doctrine of Atonement, of Messiahship, of the authority of the Bible, of Immortality, are left in a somewhat vague and chaotic condition. Possibly these things cannot be avoided in any creed; but ambiguity is the especial danger of those who, by their very profession, wish to preserve what they find it difficult to define.

" A MORAL.

"There is no particular moral that I am aware of save the necessity of a larger-minded toleration for those who, for whatever rea-

son, desire to interpret for themselves in their own way, the meaning of religion. Long ago it was said that all wise men are of the same faith, but what that faith is they very carefully refuse to explain. And the epigram or paradox covers a real truth. But if different men have different interpretations of spiritual truth; if one man will lay stress on external observances, another on definite dogmas, a third on spiritual life—it is neither wise nor possible to provide a sufficiently large or comprehensive set of articles as the summary of Christianity. Just as the slang of one age is the grammar of the next, so it is quite conceivable that the heterodoxy of a certain period may come to something very like orthodoxy in a later period. If this is what is called Antinomianism, it is an Antinomianism which corresponds with the growth of thought and the development of the world. But, possibly, there is another moral. The real mistake may be to seek to identify religion itself with any political or social movement, or with the changing thoughts of men, on such subjects as the meaning of Evil, or the Eternity of Matter. Christianity is rarely at ease in dealing with metaphysical topics. Nor has it helped the Christian faith to be assimilated in turn to the pretensions of despotism, of aristocracy, of commercial oligarchy, of democratic Socialism—the real truth being that the essence of faith is to leaven men's thoughts, and not to produce immediate structural results in society or politics. 'My Kingdom,' said Christ, 'is not of this world.' It is in truth an ideal, such as never was on sea or land, but may still remain as the inspirer of all the noble things that are done within the conditions of time and space."

THE REMOVAL OF ANDOVER SEMINARY.

DR. THOMAS ARNOLD, of Rugby, England, who was probably the foremost educator of his time, has written this remarkable sentence:—

"There is nothing so revolutionary, because there is nothing so unnatural and convulsive to society, as the strain to keep things fixed, when all the world is by the law of its creation in eternal progress; and the cause of all the evils in the world may be traced to that natural but most deadly error of human indolence and corruption, that our business is to preserve and not to improve."

We grant that it is impracticable and dangerous to attempt to keep things always as they now are, and claim that the true problem of life is to make the necessary changes in a sound and wise manner. We need to avoid the extremes of prema-

ture action and undue delay. We are not, therefore, surprised to learn that there is moral and mental unrest in England, neither are we startled by hearing that an original and energetic preacher in London has stirred up ecclesiastical discontent to such a degree that a body of the more conservative English Congregational leaders have united in formulating a brief new creed for the purpose of holding their congregations together against his influence.

There is religious unrest in this country also, and a new illustration of it is brought before us. Just as we go to press we learn that Andover Seminary, an institution founded and endowed a hundred years ago in order to oppose a belief considered at that time to be heretical, has now essentially surrendered to it. The step was taken in the face of the expressed wishes of the main body of the Alumni, and without any proper consultation with them since. The institution thus transferred to Cambridge will be located very near to an avowed Unitarian Seminary, and we are told that the two institutions will be maintained independently of one another. The line of partition between the two must be rather thin, and the control of the time-honored Seminary is practically lost by the fact that no professor in the transplanted institution can be appointed without the approval of the Corporation of Harvard University. Granting that the present controlling officers of the University are true and noble men, who will not misuse their trust for the purpose of depressing the orthodoxy of a seminary which is thus essentially given up to them, it is certain that the institution is blindly surrendered to any body of men who may hold the control of Harvard University in the future. Andover Seminary is now made over to that which Harvard University may become. Honesty is the best policy for a theological seminary as well as for a trader, and a more complete abandonment of vested rights has never been made during the history of American education. Whether or not the Alumni of Andover Seminary will tamely submit to this remains to be seen.

WILLIAM EDWARDS PARK.

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

EHE- UND FAMILIENRECHT DER HEBRÄER. Von Dr. THAD. ENGERT, Benefiziat in Ochsenfurt. Mit oberhirtlicher Druckerlaubnis. 1905. München: Verlag der J. J. Lentner'schen Buchhandlung.

This book rises above the ordinary level of the Wellhausen school. True, many of the unfortunate characteristics of modern critics—the inability to weigh evidence or test theories, the boundless credulity, the failure to collate all the material facts on controversial topics, the misunderstandings as to the true meaning of legal provisions, the almost incredible lack of literary feeling—are unhappily prominent. Moreover, the author has in many instances failed to escape from the grooves into which modern inquirers have fallen; he has used his concordance too little and some not very valuable German commentaries too much; he is too fond of speculating where he has no evidence; he is unacquainted with the best English and American work; and he has laid himself open to the criticism that if he had made a wider and deeper study of historic times he might be a little less positive about the prehistoric.

To illustrate: Dr. Engert tells us nothing about the 'father's house' (בית אב) and very little about the 'clan' (משפחה). His discussion of *Raubehe* (marriage by capture) (pp. 18–21) is a mass of conjectures, and takes no account of the evidence of the first four books of the Pentateuch (Gen. xiv., xlv.; Num. xxxi.), nor is he conscious of the absurdity of attempting to establish a chronological sequence between the various forms of marriage without having any data to go upon. When he reads in the prophets of God's having two wives (Israel and Judah) it strikes him as a proof that the custom of bigamy (i. e. taking two wives, neither fewer nor more)

must have been deeply rooted in Israel (p. 27). He has never studied the difference between a wife and the various kinds of concubines, and his discussion of slavery is rendered useless by his inability to distinguish between slaves and insolvent freemen. On pages 37-40 he makes the usual critical mistake of supposing that the supposititious "P" forbids marriage with strangers. Yet Numbers xxxi. gives express directions as to the Midianitish women, and, in contrast to Ezekiel, Leviticus xxi. requires only the high priest, and not the other priests, to marry within his own people, though these facts are of course singularly inconvenient for any theory that seeks to make Leviticus xxi. and Numbers xxxi. exilic or post-exilic. His ideas on marriage, widows, and inheritance (including the critical theories on which they are based) take no account of the fact that Ruth iv. clearly proves that the widows Naomi and Ruth had some interest in property that had been Elimelech's. Nor is it true that birthright and blessing were alike in their effects, and therefore identical (p. 79). No doubt in ordinary cases the first-born had both; but the fundamental distinction is nevertheless clear. The birthright gave the eldest son various privileges, of which the most important was an additional portion of the father's movables. The blessing, on the other hand, always deals not with property but with status. The difference in the subject-matter is similar to the difference between *dominium* and *imperium*, between ownership and sovereignty. It would be easy to point to many other errors and omissions, but we prefer to pass to Dr. Engert's merits.

We know by experience how little can be expected of the Wellhausen school, and the true measure of the author's capacity is to be found by contrasting his work with the current archæologies, commentaries, etc. From such a comparison he emerges triumphant. While he is no lawyer, he has at any rate more conception of how to handle law than most of his authorities. Indeed, many of his misfortunes appear to be due to an inadequate estimate of his own ability. We believe that Dr. Engert would do better if he could

realize that most of the writers upon whom he relies—it would be invidious to mention names—are far less able men than himself. Let him trust himself more, let him put the works of these men into his waste-basket, and make a fresh start with text, *apparatus criticus*, concordance, and comparative material, and let him conduct his investigations without any bias in favor of any critical theory. We think that in that case he might do something to fulfill the promise of this little volume. And that brings us to one of his great merits.

Dr. Engert is not merely very acute and (within limits) thorough. He has succeeded in grasping the important fact that other races also had law, and has accordingly applied the comparative method. And here we think criticism may be especially useful in assisting future work. We should ourselves be sorry to rely too much on Wilutzky's "*Vorgeschichte des Rechts*," and we commend to Dr. Engert's notice the very valuable collection of material in A. H. Post's "*Grundriss der ethnologischen Jurisprudenz*." But particularly we wish to utter a word of caution as to the work of the school of thought which is represented by such books and by the *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*. It has undoubtedly accomplished very much for scholarship, but certain precautions must be observed in utilizing the results of its labors. As one of the ablest members of this school recently said, better legal histories of the separate races are required for the future progress of ethnological jurisprudence. It is only too true that, in the past, investigators have had to trust the reports of stray travelers, and others who had no special training for such investigation. Secondly, the knowledge possessed by these investigators of any given legal system, even where the material is abundant, must necessarily be very superficial. Thirdly, ethnological jurists are after all men, who have their theories like other men, and it is sometimes necessary to reckon with possible bias.

We should also point out that, for the purposes of the Pentateuch, a first-hand study of other ancient codes is desirable. The sacred books of India, for example, and the

Roman Twelve Tables often afford much more interesting parallels than Hammurabi, whom Dr. Engert cites very frequently. And, lastly, we should wish to see more use made of the writings of the English school of comparative jurists.

We have thought it right to criticise Dr. Engert at some length, because he has done well enough to make us hope that he may do much better. But, in conclusion, we must point to an unpardonable omission which greatly reduces the value of his work. The book has no indices. Hence (in spite of its table of contents) it is practically useless to those who may wish to consult it as a book of reference.

London, England.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

OLD TESTAMENT PROBLEMS: Critical Studies in the Psalms and Isaiah. By JAMES WILLIAM THIRTLE, LL.D., D.D., Member of the Royal Asiatic Society; author of "The Titles of the Psalms: Their Nature and Meaning Explained." Crown 8vo. Pp. viii, 336. London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, New York, and Toronto: Henry Frowde. 6s., *net* (\$2.40).

Our author believes, and rightly, that the position and work of Hezekiah have not received the attention which is their due. The personality of Hezekiah and his influence upon the Jewish nationality are second only to those of David. With a strong array of argument the author maintains that the fifteen Songs of Degrees (Ps. cxx.-cxxxiv.) are commemorative of the fifteen years which were added to Hezekiah's life after the severe illness described in Isaiah xxxviii. Isaiah very likely had a hand in the collection and writing of those Songs of Degrees.

This is a theory maintained by John Lightfoot two hundred and fifty years ago, and recently by the Jewish writer Abraham Wolfson. The argument of the author in support of this position is thorough and convincing, and prepares the way for some important conclusions bearing on the interpretation of the book of Isaiah. For the prominence thus given to Hezekiah makes his personality, like that of David, a natural type of the great Messiah; so that "the Servant of the

Lord" can be easily understood, in the strictly personal sense, first, as designating Hezekiah himself, and then the great antitype who was in due time to come for the world's redemption.

Having restored Hezekiah to his proper position, our author is able, by a very interesting course of reasoning, to remove the difficulties which have been most in the way of accepting the unity of the book of Isaiah. These difficulties have almost wholly arisen from the introduction of the name of Cyrus in Isaiah xlv. and xlv. The principal difficulty has arisen, according to our author, from a slight but natural corruption of the text, involving only a single letter of the Hebrew alphabet. Now the first member of the word for 'smith' and 'carpenter' in chapter xlv. is, without the vowel-points, the same as that for Cyrus, except that a *heth* takes the place of a *caph*, both of them being gutturals. The author's contention is that, "writing with reference to Hezekiah, the breaker of images, and the strenuous servant of Jehovah, the prophet said: 'Thus said the Lord to His anointed, to the workman (or artificer) whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him,' etc. (ch. 45. 1)" (p. 253). In this view "workman" refers to Hezekiah, who, as an agent of the Lord, was to destroy the idols which the artificers of wood and iron had made. Naturally in the time of Cyrus this agency of Hezekiah could easily be transferred to Cyrus (*hârâsh* being changed to *kôrêsh*).

The entire argument is both ingenious and convincing, and will bring relief to many doubting minds which have found it difficult to answer the arguments brought against the unity of the book. At the same time the book is one which cannot be safely neglected by the destructive critics.

DIE APOSTOLISCHEN VÄTER, neu untersucht, I Teil. CLEMENS, HERMAS, BARNABAS. Von Dr. DAVID VÖLTNER, Professor der Theologie in Amsterdam. Pp. 472. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Dr. Völtner is one of the well-known advanced literary critics who has great confidence in the method of cutting, splicing,

and re-editing the early Christian literature. But he is much more cautious and considerate of organic construction than when he began his critical career. In the present volume, in which we have his mature judgment on Clement, Hermas, and Barnabas, he shows not only critical courage and originality, but a thorough knowledge of the critical literature on these writings.

He does not think that any one of the critics has yet hit upon the correct "religious-theological Typus" for interpreting Clement, which writing he considers very important as furnishing a key to the understanding of the oldest type of Christianity. Wrede, he thinks, fails to answer the real question which needs answer, *why* Clement made such an exceptional use of the Old Testament. He is also sure that Lemme is mistaken in considering Clement a Jewish Christian, especially since the letter as it now stands makes such strong use of First Corinthians, Romans, and Hebrews, and gives to the work and person of Christ a place not even surpassed in the New Testament, with the exception of the Fourth Gospel. Dr. Völtner believes that this contrast is the result of a working over in the Christian interest by an editor and by later writers. The original Clement was neither a Jew nor a Greek, but a Jewish proselyte of heathen origin who believed the Jewish religion to be a true one. Dr. Völtner devotes a chapter to a translation of what he considers the original form of the letter, and it contains in this expurgated form just one direct and harmless reference "to the words of the lord Jesus" (chap. xlv.). To obtain this result he began with chapters xxi.-xxiii., from which he rejects the Christian references. This made it easier to move backward to chapter xx. He soon drops all Christian reference from the doxologies. The number of references to Christ becoming, at each step backward and forward, fewer and more improbable, he can leave them out as the work of later Christian hands. After this task is completed, Dr. Völtner has clear sailing as to the "religious-theological Typus" of Clement. But one will need his critical courage to be without question that a real glimpse is, by this means,

to be had into the character of the oldest Christian type of thought.

The Shepherd of Hermas, Dr. Völtner considers to have grown out of Visions I.-IV. Of the gradual growth of this remarkable writing, Harnack is an advocate, but the whole was the work of the same author between the years 110 or 115 and 140 A.D. Spitta had considered the whole as the work of one writer who began as a Jew, but who, after he had written the four Visions, the Commandments, and the main Similitudes, became a Christian, and added Similitude IX. and then carefully rewrote the whole. Dr. Völtner thinks the whole book up to Sim. VIII. arose in a Jewish proselyte church, the writer being neither a Jew nor a Christian. Only toward the close of the book does the Christian enlargement appear, and a re-editing of the whole in th Christian interest. Dr. Völtner therefore gives his attention to Visions I.-IV. to make good his claims.

As to Barnabas, Dr. Völtner in 1888 came out with a very pronounced theory of readjustment by cutting and splicing. He here modifies in many particulars his original theory. But he does not agree with Harnack, who sees less and less reason for believing Barnabas a composite work. Dr. Völtner, however, now only finds the work of the later writer chiefly in the last few chapters, and a few changes of the original author. The original Barnabas has written under Vespasian, between 71 and 79 A.D., and is therefore one of the oldest of Christian epistles, older than the Didache, and a source upon which the Epistle to the Ephesians depends. The rewriting of Barnabas took place between 130 and 132 A.D., and the writer made use of the Gospel of Peter.

The real value of Dr. Völtner's work will of course entirely depend on his ability to make good his far-reaching eliminations of the Christian elements. If he succeeds, early Christianity will certainly not be what it has been considered to have been on the basis of these early Christian writings as they have stood. No one could dispute his conclusions, if he considers this critical work justifiable. But the more unlike this

early Christianity of Dr. Völtner's is to later Christianity, the greater will he probably find his task to be.

ALBERT T. SWING.

CHOIX DE TEXTES RELIGIEUX ASSYRO-BABYLONIENS, transcription, traduction, commentaire. Par le P. DHORME, des Frères Prêcheurs, professeur d'assyrien à Saint-Étienne de Jerusalem. 8vo. Pp. xxxvii, 406. Paris: Lecoffre. 1907. 12 f.

This volume is one of the series of *Études bibliques* which the scholarly Dominicans of the French School of Archæology in Jerusalem are issuing. Lagrange's "Études sur les religions semitiques" and Vincent's "Canaan d'après l'exploration récent" have appeared in the same series. These works have not received the attention from Protestant scholars which they deserve. No worker in these fields can afford to ignore them.

Dhorme opens his book with a brief statement of the main features of the Babylonian and Assyrian religion. He then gives in transliteration and translation the Creation poem, a Chaldean cosmogony from CT¹ XIII, 35-37, an Assyrian cosmogony from CT, XIII, 24, 25, the creation of the other animals from AL³ 94 ff., and CT, XIII, 34, the tree of Eridu, the deluge, the fragment of a second recension of the deluge discovered by Scheil, the dialogue between Ea and Xisthuros, the story of Ea and Atarhasis, the institution of priesthood from Zimmern's "Beiträge" and Craig's "Texts," the myth of Adapa, the myth of Etana, the Gilgamesh Epic (from which the deluge story is omitted because previously given), the descent of Ishtar to the lower world, the speech of Bel-Marduk from Reisner's "Hymns," p. 7, a hymn to Marduk from IV² R 21* and AL⁴, 81 ff., a hymn to Ishtar from King's "Seven Tablets of Creation," II, LXXV, the psalm to Ishtar from AL³, 134, the prayer to Gibil, the god of fire, from AL³, 133, the just sufferer from IV² R 60*, the pretended

¹ CT=Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum; AL³=Delitzsch's *Assyrische Lesestücke*, 3d ed.; AL⁴=4th ed. of same work; V R=Rawlinson's *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, Vol. V; IV² R=the 2d ed. of Vol. IV of the same work.

Babylonian Sabbath from IV R 32 f. and AL⁴, 82, the tablet of worship from Sippar from V R 60, 61, and proverbs from AL⁴, 118 ff. An index of proper names follows, and a table of contents.

The author is fully abreast of the literature and has done his work well. He is independent in his judgments, and his opinions are always worthy of consideration, even if one disagree with him. His work compares favorably with that of Jensen. He places Mount *Mashu* of the Gilgamish epic rightly in Arabia together with the park of precious stones. He has not been led away by Jensen's latest theory that the reference is to Phoenicia and the Mediterranean Sea. It seems a pity to remove the account of the deluge from the rest of the Gilgamish epic, but perhaps this is justified in a series intended for Biblical students, as it makes it stand out more prominently.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

A STUDY OF THE EARLIEST LETTERS OF CASPAR SCHWENCKFELD VON OSSIG. Editor, CHESTER DAVID HARTRANFT. (*Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum*, published under the auspices of the Schwenckfelder Church, Pennsylvania, and the Hartford Theological Seminary, Connecticut. Volume I.) Norristown, Pa.: Board of Publication of the Schwenckfelder Church; Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel. 1907. M. 25.

This is the first of seventeen volumes in which are to be gathered the writings of Schwenckfeld, his associates, and his important successors in that branch of the Church which bears his name, the concluding volume of the series being devoted to a biography, in which the writings and influence of Schwenckfeld are to be critically and historically evaluated by President Hartranft.

Surely this is a colossal undertaking for a church numbering only 1,000 members, which has already expended upon the undertaking upward of \$40,000. Yet it must be regarded as justified, not merely as an act of filial devotion, but as a worthy recognition of the great importance and unique position of Schwenckfeld in the history of the Reformation.

Of noble birth, yet a true democrat; without orders, yet a profound and logical theologian; in intimate relations with all the various phases of thought into which the leaders of the Reformers diverged; an individual who thought for himself and would follow neither Luther nor Zwingli; advocate of religious liberty and of the right of private assembly,—Schwenckfeld in his opinions had much more in common with our time than any other Reformer, and the study of his writings, with the help of the elaborate critical and historical notes with which they are accompanied, may alter in many particulars our opinions as to the history of the early years of the Reformation.

This volume is devoted to seven documents, written by Schwenckfeld during the years 1521–1524. In general the order is: first the text of the document, preceded by a bibliography and followed by a translation into English; then critical notes, often of great length, in which are discussed the language, the history, and the theology of the document. Where the extent of the document justifies it, there follows a vocabulary.

The work, therefore, will have significance, not only to the church historian, and to the theologian, but also to the student of the German language.

It is to be hoped that the sale of this first volume will be such as to make possible the continuation of this worthy enterprise.

Oberlin, Ohio.

AZARIAH S. ROOT.

LUTHER'S TABLE TALK: A Critical Study. (Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Vol. XXVI. No. 2.) By PRESERVED SMITH, Ph.D. 8vo. Pp. 135. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1907. Paper, \$1.00.

This book furnishes a fine example of the technique of modern criticism. It is a study in bibliography, splendidly scientific and exhaustive, leaving nothing from that point of view to be desired.

He treats critically the twelve sources of the Luther Tischenreden and Tagebücher. The nine chapters of the book present all the important phases of the subject, and as the chapters are not exclusive some of the phases appear more than once. His judgment is probably correct that only the original notes, and those preserved in Mathesius should be relied on, and that the final collections of Lauterbach and Aurifaber are too unreliable for use. He would therefore seek to restore the chronological order as the only historical one, and he would like to see a text in which the sources for each saying should be clearly indicated. What cannot be placed in chronological order should go to an appendix. As to these original sources (not the collections), he thinks "the greatest faith can be placed in Lauterbach, Dietrich, Schlagenhaufen, and almost as much in Mathesius, Besold, and Heidenreich.

Dr. Smith shows himself a bright writer; and even in this technical study he has inserted many interesting glimpses into the life of Luther. This "Table-Talk phase," taking as it does the personal and half-conscious life of a great man as its subject, has much in it. Such literature is always subject to grave misuse, when held too rigidly to the cold rules of scientific history. But Dr. Smith has shown such a real insight into the charms as well as intricacies of his subject that one could wish him to carry his task into the production of a book showing not only what Luther said in reality, and the occasion which called it out, but the personal and broad significance of it all in the psychology of the man.

ALBERT T. SWING.

LIFE IN THE HOMERIC AGE. By THOMAS DAY SEYMOUR, Hillhouse Professor of the Greek Language and Literature in Yale University. 8vo. Pp. xvi, 704. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$4.00, *net*.

This book exemplifies the thoroughness which the author carried into everything that he did. It is, however, not only a work of prodigious industry, but will appeal to all who have an interest in the Homeric poems. In the preface we are told that "the author's point of view has been philological, not

archæological. From the poet's language he has attempted to discover what was before the poet's mind." Only a protracted and sympathetic study could have produced a book so scholarly and so fascinating. Most readers will be surprised at the abundance and appositeness of the illustrations from the Bible. To his students Professor Seymour had been known as a profound and reverent student of the Scriptures, and it is surprising to note how much light is shed and how much the interpretation has been helped by Hebrew parallels. In the nineteen chapters which make up the book, the endeavor has been made, and on the whole successfully, to cover the whole of Homeric antiquities. The typography is inviting, the binding attractive. Illustrations are not numerous, since the author "seeks to set forth with regard to the Homeric antiquities simply what may be learned from the Homeric poems themselves, with such illustration as is obvious or naturally presented from other sources." In the Bibliography one misses the name of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, although the brilliant German is twice referred to in the text. The only serious criticism (criticism which applies to the book only as a work of reference) is the absence of an index of the passages in the poems referred to in the text. Such an index would have occupied several pages (the passages referred to in eight books of the *Odyssey*, Books V-XII, number between seven and eight hundred), but would have enhanced the value of the book. Every reader of "*Life in the Homeric Age*" will find a new interest in the poems and will take them up with added zest. It is an important contribution to the literature of the subject and a notable monument of American scholarship.

Oberlin, Ohio.

CHARLES B. MARTIN.

WOMAN: Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome, and among the early Christians. By JAMES DONALDSON, M.A., LL.D., Principal of the University of St. Andrews. 8vo. Pp. 278. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1907. \$1.60.

This rather sketchy treatment of an important subject is

presented in four books or divisions, which are reprints, with various additions and some revision, of five articles that appeared in the *Contemporary Review* twenty to thirty years ago. The arrangement of matter is chronological. The first book deals with the position and influence of woman in ancient Greece. The virtues of Homeric and Spartan women are extolled, and Sappho and Aspasia are defended and praised. Book II. considers the position and influence of women in ancient Rome. The marriage reforms of Augustus are briefly described, and the view is expressed, undoubtedly the correct one, that the morals of the first century of the Roman Empire were not really as bad as they are painted if we compare the state of affairs in other countries and periods. The descriptions of Martial and Juvenal are to be taken *cum grano salis*. They are what we should call to-day, in referring to newspaper writing, merely "sensational," that is, they record the unusual or striking events, not the typical or representative ones. Book III. passes to the period of early Christianity and explains the subsequent degradation of women. The closing book is supplementary to the chapters dealing with these three periods and is in the nature of an appendix. A list of books closely related to the subject is appended to the whole, but while this is quite long, some indispensable references, such as Dill and Marquardt, are not mentioned. Little has been written in English on the status of women in ancient Greece and Rome, and while Principal Donaldson devotes 250 pages to this theme, his book is necessarily brief and is moreover cast in an almost entirely popular form.

Ann Arbor, Mich.

WALTER DENNISON.

THE RECORDS OF THE PAST

PARTIAL CONTENTS—Volume VI., 1907.

- Climate and History in Western Asia (5 Illustrations). By E. Cutler Shedd.
Development of the System of Boundary Fortifications in Britain and Germany under the Roman Empire. By George H. Allen.
Troglydote Dwellings of Bakhtchi-Sarai (11 Illustrations). By G. Frederick Wright.
The McEvers Mounds, Pike County, Ill. (2 Illustrations). By Clara K. Bayliss.
The Nebraska Loess Man (5 Illustrations). By Robert F. Gilder.
Ancient Inhabitants of Nebraska (5 Illustrations). By Erwin H. Barbour.
Roman North Africa (8 Illustrations). By C. Densmore Curtis.
Prehistoric Man in Nebraska. By E. E. Blackman.
Mound Builders of the Mississippi Valley (7 Illustrations). By Richard Herrmann.
Palestine Exploration Fund. By Theodore F. Wright.
A Primitive Cattle Shrine in Asia Minor (3 Illustrations). By George E. White.
Nehawka Flint Quarries (6 Illustrations). By E. E. Blackman.
The Autobiographic Element in Latin Literature and Inscriptions (5 Illustrations). By Henry H. Armstrong.
Site of Ancient Persepolis (4 Illustrations). By Thomas F. Nelson.
Preserving Wisconsin Mounds (2 Illustrations). By Frank A. Flower.
Pre-Indian Inhabitants of North America (16 Illustrations). By Newton H. Winchell.
Work of the Ohio Archaeological Society.
Ancient Pottery Furnaces. By Frank A. Flower.
Lead Furnaces. By W. M. F. Petrie.
Soul-Houses in Egypt (8 Illustrations). By A. L. Kroeber.
Relics of the Stone Age from Taltal, Chile.
Archæological Work of the University of California.
Amber in Asia. By Eunice G. Allyn.
The Evolution of the Greek Fret (8 Illustrations). By Edmund von Mach.
Greek Draped Figure at Vassar (6 Illustrations). By Count Maurice de Perigny.
Maya Ruins in Quintana Roo. By Charles De W. Brower.
The Swastika. By George E. White.
The Hittite Capital, Boghaz-keuy and its Environs (12 Illustrations). By St. John Seymour.
New Light on Babylonian Chronology. By Edmund von Mach.
The Rock of Cashel (4 Illustrations). By Edmund von Mach.
Interdependent Evolution of Oases and Civilizations. By Albert T. Clay.
Egyptian Research Account. By Edmund von Mach.
An Archæological Tour through Sicily with a Camera (22 Illustrations). By Frederick Bennett Wright.
The Beginnings of Iron.
A Palæolithic Implement from the Loess (2 Illustrations). By Luella A. Owen.
Roman Portrait Head in Vassar College (6 Illustrations). By Albert T. Clay.
The Liver in Babylonian Divination (5 Illustrations). By Edmund von Mach.
Adolf Furtwangler.
Huntington's "Explorations in Central Asia" (5 Illustrations).

Specimen Lines from the Catalogue

OF

Charles Thigam & Son

Second-Hand Booksellers, 27a Farringdon Street,
London, E.C., England

- Ancestor** (The). Edited by OSWALD BARRON, F.S.A. 12 vols., sm. folio, £2 2s. 1902-5
- Anglo-Catholic Theology** (The Library of). 88 vols., 8vo, £4 14s. 6d. Orford, 1841
- Arbuthnott Missal** (The). [Edited by Bp. Forbes.] 4to, £3 3s. Burntisland, 1864
- Bampton Lectures** (The): A COMPLETE SET, 1780 to 1907, 122 vols., 8vo, £35.
- Baptists** (The History of the English), by THOMAS CROSBY, 4 vols., sm. 8vo, £3 3s. 1738-40
- Bernardi** (St.) *Clara-Vallensis*, Opera Omnia, 4 vols., roy. 8vo, £2. 1839
- Biblia Polyglotta** edit. WALTONUS, cum CASTELLI Lexicon, 8 vols., folio, £8 8s. 1657-86
- Biblical Archaeology** (Society of): TRANSACTIONS AND PROCEEDINGS, 32 vols., 8vo, £6 6s. 1872-1901
- Billings** (R.W.) Baronia and Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Scotland, 4 vols., 4to, £3 3s. 1901
- Book of Common Prayer** (The): 1549-1844, *Pickering's Reprints*, 7 vols. folio, £7 7s. 1844
— of King Edward VII.: Essex House Press Edition, folio, £5 5s. 1903
- Boole** (G.) An Investigation of the Laws of Thought, 8vo, 1£ 15s.
- Bradshaw Society** (Henry). Vols. I. to XXXIV., 30 vols. in 8vo and 4 in 4to, £20. 1891-1907
- British Quarterly Review** (The): A COMPLETE SET, 83 vols., 8vo, £14 14s. 1845-86
- Buxtorffii** (Joh.) *P. Lexicon Chaldaicum*, editit B. FISCHERUS, roy. 8vo, £2 17s. 6d. 1869
- Christian World Pulpit** (The): A COMPLETE SET to Dec. 1907, 72 vols., 4to, £12.
- Church Congress Reports**: A COMPLETE SET, to 1900, 46 vols., 8vo, £4 10s.
- Church Quarterly Review** (The): A COMPLETE SET, to April, 1908, 8vo, £6 15s.
- Daniel** (H. A.) Thesaurus Hymnologicus, 5 vols., 8vo, £6. 1841-1856
— Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiae Universae, 4 vols., 8vo, £2 12s. 6d. 1847-51
- Expositor** (The), edited by S. COX, D.D., W. R. NICHOLL, D.D., 72 vols., 8vo, £8 10s. 1875-1907
- Grub** (G.) An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, 4 vols., 8vo, £1 16s. 1861
- Hefele** (Dr. C. J.) UND CARD. HERGENROTHER, *Concilien Geschichte*, 9 vols., 8vo, £2 12s. 6d. 1873-90
- Hereford Missal** (The). Edited by Dean HENDERSON. 8vo, £2. [Privately Printed.] 1874
- Hibbert Lectures** (The): BEST EDITION, 15 vols., 8vo, £2 10s. 1878-94
- Hook** (Dean) Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 12 vols., 8vo, £4 12s. 6d. 1890-76
- Husenbeth** (F. C.) D.D. Emblems of Saints. THIRD EDITION, 8vo, £2 10s. 1882
- Journal of Sacred Literature** (The) 40 vols., 8vo, £2 17s. 6d. 1848-68
- Law** (Rev. W.) Notes and Materials for an adequate Biography of him, 8vo, £1 11s. 6d. 1854
- Library of Fathers** (A) of the Holy Catholic Church, 48 vols., 8vo, £10 10s. 1838
- Mischna**, notis illustravit G. SURENHUSIUS, 6 vols., folio, £5 5s. Amsteladami, 1698-1702

Full particulars concerning the above-named, or any other books "wanted," may be obtained from the Advertisers. Also—gratis and postpaid—periodically-published Catalogues of additions to their very extensive stock.

OFFER TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS: THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA FOR 1908
AND DR. WRIGHT'S "SCIENTIFIC CONFIRMATIONS OF OLD TESTAMENT
HISTORY," FOR \$3.25.

SEVENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

JULY, 1908.

THE

JUN 25 1908

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly

EDITOR

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

ASSOCIATED WITH

FRANK H. FOSTER, D. W. SIMON, JAMES LINDSAY, HUGH M. SCOTT, CHARLES
F. THWING, NEWELL DWIGHT HILLIS, A. A. BERLE, WILLIAM
E. BARTON, WILLIAM EDWARDS PARK, HENRY A.
STIMSON, HERBERT W. MAGOUN.

CONTENTS

THE PLAGUES OF EGYPT (I.)	Edward M. Merrins.	401
THE SAMARITAN SABBATH.	Jacob, Son of Aaron.	430
PROFESSOR GEORGE F. MOORE ON MINISTERIAL TRAINING.		
	A. A. Berle.	445
THE PREACHER AND THE TIMES.	William J. Hutchins.	452
THE EXPERT MINISTER AND HIS TRAINING OF HIS LAYMEN.		
	George Walter Fiske.	465
ESSAYS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM (I.)	Harold M. Wiener.	481
THE UNITAS FRATRUM.	Louis F. Miskovsky.	510
HOMER AND THE HIGHER CRITICS.	William Wallace Everts.	531
PROGRESS AND PRESENT STATUS OF TRI-CHURCH UNION.		
	Lucien C. Warner.	557
EVOLUTION AND THE MIRACULOUS.	Gabriel Campbell	572
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.		586

OBERLIN, OHIO, U. S. A.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

EUROPEAN AGENTS, CHARLES HIGHAM & SON, LONDON.

SINGLE NUMBER, 75 CENTS.

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.00.

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History

By G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

D.D., LL.D., F. G. S. A.

PRESS NOTICES.

"The appearance of Dr. Wright's book at the present juncture is extremely opportune. The battle of Higher Criticism has in great measure run on linguistic and historical lines, and if there be any reference to science in connection with the earlier books of the Bible it is as a rule a contemptuous brushing aside of the idea that Biblical science and latter-day science could possibly be in accord, as when in a recent book we read '[Genesis i.] is a veritable Old Man of the Sea to commentators.' Dr. Wright has travelled widely for the sake of exploration in both the Old and New World, and does not, like too many professors on this side of the Atlantic, reconstruct the scheme of the Bible from his study chair."—*The Record* (England).

"The title of this work is fully justified by its learned contents. No thoughtful mind—no sincere searcher for the truth—can give due consideration to the vast accumulation of scientific facts arranged by the author in this volume and fail to be confirmed in a belief of the accuracy of the historical statements of the Old Testament. It is a marvelous unfolding of the geological events of the post-Tertiary period, well calculated to incite the general reader to a closer study of its significant and overwhelming facts, which invite investigation on every hand. The discussion is also eminently worthy of the attention of geologists, many of whom, the author observes, are so engrossed in their particular studies that they have little leisure or inclination to consider the action of geological forces in their more general application. . . . We consider Dr. Wright's book a most valuable contribution to the literature of scientific Bible defence, and wish for it a very wide circulation."—*English Churchman*.

"The facts brought to light are of supreme interest, and may modify some of the conclusions of Old Testament criticism."—*British Congregationalist*.

"The most important part of the book is undoubtedly the extended treatment from chaps. vi. to xi. of the Biblical account of the Noachian Deluge in its relation to the facts of science. Here the author writes on a subject in relation to which he has first-hand knowledge and is an admitted expert, and the mass of facts he accumulates from all parts of the globe seem to prove beyond dispute the reality of a great catastrophe after or in connection with the close of the glacial period, which swept away the forms of life then existing, and made a complete break between older and newer man."—JAMES ORR, D.D., *Homiletic Review*.

"If the destructive critics and the skeptics who attack the Old Testament were only open to argument, this book would settle the question for them. . . . The last chapter is the best discussion of its subject we have seen. The whole book is strengthening and even inspiring. Whoever would be posted should get this admirable work."—DR. T. T. EATON, *Western Recorder*.

"He is very happy in his style of telling us what he has seen, and why he interpreted it as he does, and what is the bearing of his work on the Bible. The volume bids fair to be recognized as the standard work on the important subject of Pentateuchal physics; just as explorations of the ruins of Chaldea, Assyria, and Egypt have enlightened us as to Old Testament historicity."—DR. G. MACLOSKIE, *Princeton Review*.

The Bibliotheca Sacra Company

OBERLIN, OHIO.

Studies in Biblical Law

BY

HAROLD M. WIENER, *M.A., LL. B.*

OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
FORMERLY A SENIOR WHEWELL SCHOLAR OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

"As a whole, these 'Studies' are of unusual worth. They accomplish for certain Old Testament themes what Greenleaf, Lyttleton, and West did in New Testament lines . . . no one will doubt that the author has attempted a most important task and has succeeded well. He has done much to clear the atmosphere where there was overmuch fog. The work deserves to be well known among all students of the older part of God's Word."—*Review and Expositor*.

"It is bold and refreshing . . . our writer goes over ground trodden nearly two thousand years ago by the sages of the Mishnah; but he strikes out in his own line and stands forth much more logical than the old Pharisaic doctors."—*New York Evening Post*.

"There is no doubt that in this examination of the Biblical jurial laws Mr. Wiener has opened up a new and valuable source of information as to the dates of the various books of the Pentateuch."—*Academy*.

". . . both moral and interesting. . . The method employed is an ingenious and skillful application of the principles of legal interpretation to texts in apparent conflict."—*Harvard Law Review*.

"In the simplest and quietest way, though with a very firm grasp of the subject, the author shows the impossibilities, and in some cases the real absurdities, of certain contentions of modern criticism; and in our judgment he clearly convicts the writers . . . referred to of sacrificing reality and common-sense to matters of philological theory. . . We recommend this volume to the careful attention of our readers."—*Churchman* (London).

"Altogether the volume is one of great importance and value."—*Bibliotheca Sacra*.

LONDON : DAVID NUTT
57-59 LONG ACRE

A List of Helpful Books For Christian Workers

Charlotte Vander Veen

The Things That Make a Woman

The secret for the very large sale of this booklet is the beautiful message so delightfully told. Cloth, 25c.

W. E. Biederwolf, D.D.

The Christian and Amusements

A most acceptable treatment of this difficult subject, not harsh, but convincing. Cloth, 25c.

George W. Gere

Did Jesus Rise?

A larger View of the resurrection, bound in Gray Silk Cloth, 25c.

Mary W. Bronson

His Sister!

Is a beautiful character sketch of Jesus. The creating facts of Christ's Daily Life and Surroundings—in story form. Intensely Interesting. 35c.

Edwin J. Hellenback

Passion for Souls

One man has said of this book, that if a publishing house never put out another book, their mission would have been plain, for having issued so great a work as this. Another man recently gave us an order for 7,000 copies in special edition for free distribution. These testimonials speak for themselves. Cloth, 40c.

James M. Gray, D.D.

How to Master the English Bible

Dr. Gray's success in stimulating and effectually directing Bible study has exerted an influence international in scope. The secret of the results of Dr. Gray's Bible teaching is given in this book. It sets forth the excellency of his expository methods of Bible study. Cloth, 40c.

The Famous Growing Series

It is hard to conceive of a more helpful or entertaining set of books. Beautifully bound, 50c.

The Growing Pastor

James G. K. McClure, D.D.

The Growing Church

Cleland Boyd McAfee, D.D.

The Growing Christian

W. E. Biederwolf, D.D. 50c. each

"Sensible, practical and well illustrated by anecdote and simile, these talks, suggested by the New Testament accounts of and references to the church at Ephesus, are worthy of a wide circulation among all evangelical Christians."—The Congregationalist.

Daniel H. Martin.

Concerning Them Which Are Asleep.

Fine art binding. 50c.

A beautiful booklet charmingly printed, with a strong and strengthening message of comfort to those who mourn. Here where there is so much danger of mere sentimentality, it is refreshing to find good common sense combined with gentlest sympathy and highest spirituality.

A beautifully bound little book, which from title to finish is a source of comfort to all who mourn the loved ones "who are not dead,, but sleep in Jesus."

Helen E. Starrett

Letters to a Daughter. 60c.

This wonderful book has gone into its second edition, and is performing a remarkable ministry. The letters are on practical subjects, and are designed to guide the "daughters" who read them into safe channels of thought and industry. The book is very choice. It is bound in rich brown boards, with labels for title and author's name. Unique and chaste.

Melvin E. Trotter

Jimmy Moore of Bucktown. 75c.

This is a splendid book, and none should fail to secure a copy and read it.

Mr. Trotter is an original fellow, and does nothing in a conventional way. The skill he has displayed in delineating the characters is indeed remarkable. The story is absorbingly interesting from beginning to end, and despite the fact that his theme is a religious one, the book is absolutely free from cant and dogmatism. In fact, it does not read like a religious book at all, and everyone who picks it up will be entranced by the freshness of the style, the novelty of the situations and the naturalness of the characters. There is not a dull page or a prosy line in the volume, and it ought to have a record-breaking sale.

Joel C. Massee, D.D.

Evangelism in the Pew. 75c.

This great book is one of our latest publications and one of which we are justly proud. The theme is vital and one which is bound to attract attention. The mission of the layman is thought by some to be the greatest ministry of the day. The writer of this unique book has a live message to deliver. Read this book—and pass it on.

THE WINONA PUBLISHING CO. : : 24 Adams St., CHICAGO

Latest "Open Court" Publications

AVESTA ESCHATOLOGY, compared with the Books of Daniel and Revelation. By Lawrence H. Mills. 85 pp. Boards. Price 50c. Extra edition, Strathmore paper, gilt top. Price 75c.

THE MESSIANIC HOPE OF THE SAMARITANS. By Jacob, Son of Aaron, High Priest of the Samaritans. Edited with an introduction by William Eleazar Barton. Price 25c.

Religions: Ancient and Modern

The Series is intended to present to a large public the salient features of the GREAT RELIGIONS of the Human Race. The Volumes already published have met with most gratifying appreciation.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, 40 cents net per volume

NOW PUBLISHED

ANIMISM. By Edward Clodd.

PANTHEISM. By James Allanson Picton.

CELTIC RELIGION. By Professor Anwyl.

MYTHOLOGY OF ANCIENT BRITAIN AND IRELAND. By Charles Squire.

ANCIENT EGYPT. By Professor W. M. Flinders Petrie.

SCANDINAVIAN RELIGION. By W. A. Craigie.

MAGIC AND FETISHISM. By Dr. A. C. Haddon.

HINDUISM. By Dr. L. D. Barnett.

ANCIENT CHINA. By Prof. Giles.

ANCIENT GREECE. By Jane Harrison.

BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA. By Theophilus G. Pinches.

ISLAM. By Syed Ameer Ali, M.A.

RELIGION OF ANCIENT ROME. By Cyril Bailey, M.A.

JUDAISM. By Israel Abrahams.

SHINTO: THE ANCIENT RELIGION OF JAPAN. By W. G. Aston, C.M.G., LL.D.

IN PREPARATION

THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT ISRAEL. By Professor Jastrow.

THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT MEXICO AND PERU. By Lewis Spence.

ISLAM IN INDIA. By T. W. Arnold, Assistant Librarian at the India Office, Author of "The Preaching of Islam."

BUDDHISM. 2 vols. By Professor T. W. Rhys Davids, LL.D.

THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT PERSIA. By Dr. A. V. Williams Jackson, Professor of Iranian at Columbia University.

PRIMITIVE OR NICENE CHRISTIANITY. By John Sutherland Black, LL.D., Joint Editor of the "Encyclopædia Biblica."

MEDIÆVAL CHRISTIANITY.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION. By Dr. Leuba.

The Open Court Publishing Co.

1322 Wabash Avenue : Chicago

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

The Oldest Theological Quarterly in America

Prof. G. Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D., Editor

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Rev. Frank H. Foster, D.D., Ph.D., Olivet, Michigan.

Rev. James Lindsay, D.D., Kilmarnock, Scotland.

Rev. D. W. Simon, D.D., Bradford, England.

Rev. Hugh M. Scott, D.D., Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Charles F. Thwing, D.D., Pres. Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rev. A. A. Berle, D.D., Salem, Mass.

Rev. W. E. Barton, D.D., Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Henry A. Stimson, D.D., New York City.

Rev. William Edwards Park, D.D., Oberlin, Ohio.

Herbert William Magoun, Ph.D., Cambridge, Mass.

¶ As heretofore the *Bibliotheca Sacra* will aim to meet the wants of the more intelligent public, both lay and clerical of all denominations, in the publication of thorough discussions of all topics of permanent interest touching the Christian religion. Prominence will continue to be given to Biblical Criticism in its various departments; Theology in its doctrinal, historical and practical aspects; and the Relation of Philosophy, Science, and Oriental Discoveries to the Bible.

¶ In addition to the continued interest of the able corps of Associate Editors, special advantages may be expected to result the coming year from the fact that Dr. Simon is to take up his permanent residence in Germany, and hence will be able to furnish fresh information from the center of intellectual movements.

¶ On account of the freedom of the Editor from the routine duties of his professorship, he will be able to give increased attention to the interests of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and adapt it still more perfectly to the deepest needs of the time. The *Quarterly* will continue its elaborate and conservative discussion of the great sociological questions that are agitating the century, but will, as heretofore, be devoted mainly to discussions by competent authorities of the profound theological and critical problems which are agitating the entire Christian public. While remaining loyal to the historic faith of Christendom, it will aim to welcome and aid all real progress in every department of human activity. On account of its long standing, and its undenominational character, the *Bibliotheca Sacra* probably has a wider circulation than any other American publication. Through it the ablest writers can at once reach every center of thought in the world. While not aiming at ephemeral popularity, in a marked degree it accomplishes the purpose of influencing the thought that in the end moves the world. Whatever periodicals of a more popular character are taken by pastors, theological students, and the more intelligent laymen, such thorough discussions as appear in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* are indispensable to a complete mastery of the great themes that are constantly coming to the surface in modern thought.

Address,

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, *Oberlin, O.*

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

ARTICLE I.

THE PLAGUES OF EGYPT.

BY EDWARD M. MERRINS, M.D., EAST ORANGE, NEW JERSEY.

THE general influence of the current teaching of science seems unfavorable to the growth and maintenance of a sturdy faith in the good providence of God. That He not only governs the nations of the earth and leads them to their appointed destiny, but that his care extends to the smallest matter of the individual human life, in the words of Jesus, the very hairs of the head being numbered; that it includes within its ministrations all forms of animal life, the raven being fed by Him, and the sparrow not falling to the ground without his knowledge; in fine, that "He is ever present with His works one by one, and confronts everything He has made by His particular and most loving providence, and manifests Himself to each according to its needs," are comfortable statements not easily believed by this generation. Science disclaims all knowledge of a God to whom such epithets as holy, wise, loving, can be applied; nor does it acknowledge that He controls all natural laws for his own gracious purposes. There is a First Cause, but it is inscrutable. Man can trace the laws of nature, but of their real essence he knows nothing; all he can be sure of is that throughout the wide domains of time,

Vol. LXV. No. 259. 1

space, matter, and life these laws reign supreme, being universal, uniform, inexorable. So it has come to pass that even religious teachers regard as incredible those exceptional episodes in the lives of individuals, or in the history of nations, recorded in the Scriptures, which were held to be special or marvelous manifestations of God's power for the good of the world. In the judgment of the most outspoken, the miraculous narratives of the Bible, when not regarded as poesies, are stultifying to science and common sense, antagonistic to the higher activities of true faith, and an intelligent man who affirms his belief in them does not know what intellectual honesty means.

Such uncompromising, unequivocal statements are rather disconcerting to the ordinary believer, who is unable to rise quickly to new altitudes of faith, or without strength to accompany these religious guides along a path described by themselves as a *via dolorosa*. This is not to be wondered at, for consider some of the issues involved. By faith Moses, at the time of the exodus, instituted the Passover and the sprinkling of blood, that the destroyer of the first-born of the Egyptians should not touch the Hebrews. For thousands of years the Jews have celebrated annually this deliverance, strengthening faith in their own spiritual vocation, and finding comfort in their troubles and adversities, by recalling what God did for their ancestors. "O God, we have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that thou didst in their days and in the old time before them: O Lord, arise, help us, and deliver us for thine honor." This in effect has been their constant prayer. This ancient deliverance is now said to be a pious myth. God did not set his signs in Egypt, nor his wonders in the field of Zoan. "In truth, though the story of the plagues is not without interest, it is

nothing but a theologoumenon." ¹ This is a hard saying, who can bear it?

When the Apostle Paul in a famous argument contends for the absolute sovereignty of God over human life and history, having mercy on whom He will and hardening whom He will, the Pharaoh of the exodus is cited as an instance of one whose heart was indurated by the judgments of God. Now if the plagues are nothing but the invention of a pious imagination, or myths slowly developed, the citation, to say the least, is very unfortunate. But the sturdy Calvinist need not be discouraged. According to the writer just quoted, "God is not banished from the history of Israel, even if the Exodus was attended by no physical signs and wonders, no slaughter of the Egyptian first-born, no drowning of a hostile king in the Red Sea." The difficulty is that when an alleged historical event, as the migration of the Hebrews, is shorn of all its accompaniments, and it stands isolated, unrelated to anything before or after, it also is soon declared incredible.

Leaving the defense of the supernatural to abler writers, it is the modest purpose of this article to attempt to show that the narrative of the plagues, even when divested of all that can be called miraculous, is worthy of credence as the record of a series of remarkable national calamities culminating in a terrible outbreak of pestilence, an outbreak which perhaps Moses foresaw when he said to Pharaoh before the plagues began: "The God of the Hebrews hath met with us: let us go, we pray thee, three days' journey into the wilderness, and sacrifice unto the Lord our God; lest he fall upon us with pestilence, or with the sword" (Ex. v. 3).

In support of the credibility of the narrative from this point

¹ Cheyne, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, article "Plague."

of view, a few preliminary observations may not be out of place. If an exodus of the Hebrews from Egypt actually occurred at the beginning of their national history,—and all writers seem to concede this,—surely it was preceded by events which stirred profoundly the minds of the Egyptians and induced them to make the very heavy sacrifice involved in the liberation. Slaves have seldom or never won emancipation easily: a price has always been paid of some kind. It were an anachronism to suppose the migration was permitted from philanthropic motives. No other explanation is so easy to believe as the one given in Scripture, that the Hebrews were hurried out of the country because the Egyptians were panic-stricken by disasters for which they held their slaves accountable.

In the next place, a succession of disasters culminating in pestilence is not incredible. Other nations have had the same sad experience. In A.D. 1333 there was an epidemic of bubonic plague in China: in the central provinces it was preceded by parching drought and famine, then by violent torrents of rain and earthquakes; in the southern provinces by drought, famine, a plague of locusts, and much sickness.¹ Irak and Syria near the close of the same century were depopulated by a series of destructive earthquakes, followed by famine, epidemics, epizootics, and plague.² Epidemics of plague in the valley of the Euphrates in 1867, and again in 1873, were preceded by great inundations. Its outbreak in the province of Bengazi, North Africa, followed on four years' drought, when the greater part of the flocks and herds had perished from want of food and from disease, plague breaking out among the people when

¹ Hecker, *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*.

² Simpson, *Treatise on Plague*, p. 20.

they were suffering most from famine, and when their physical and social misery was greatest. Previous to a plague epidemic in Hongkong in 1894, several extraordinary phenomena were noticed, among them visitations of caterpillars, which attacked the trees and grain in such multitudes that the government had to take measures to destroy the pests. Abnormal seasons preceded the plague in Bombay in 1896,¹ and in Cape Town in 1901, where a rare comet was visible for several nights.²

Further, as great physical disasters have often led to social and political changes,³ or have been synchronous with them, the mere fact that striking episodes in the history of other nations became invested in the course of time with a mythical halo, furnishes no strong argument, in and by itself, for doubting the events of the exodus. History proves that when nation has risen against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, not infrequently there have been great earthquakes, famines, pestilences, and other calamities. When the Roman Empire was tottering to its fall, the general disorder was aggravated by an unusual train of calamities. Besides the ruin of society attendant on the invasion of the empire by barbarians, there came a succession of droughts, pestilences, and earthquakes, which seemed to keep pace with the throes of the moral world. It was under the pressure of these calamities that the Litany of the Episcopal Church, with its pleadings for deliverance from "lightning and tempest," "plague, pestilence, and fam-

¹ Report, Health Officer of Bombay, 1896.

² Simpson, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

³ The severe visitation of plague in England in the reign of Edward III. changed the system of land tenure, and led indirectly to the Protestant Reformation, as unworthy men then crept into the church as priests to fill the numerous vacancies caused by the plague, and their evil influence lived after them.

ine," from "battle, murder, and sudden death," etc., was compiled, and became a part of the ordinary church service.¹

Turning to modern history, in the year preceding the great French Revolution a severe drought was followed on the eve of the harvest by a hailstorm of extraordinary violence and extent, which destroyed the crops for sixty leagues round Paris. This was followed by the severest winter known for eighty years. In the spring and summer of 1789, food was at famine prices; throughout the land there was great distress. In July of the same year, the revolution began in earnest, the people being driven to it more by hunger and misery than by the desire for political freedom. Again, the course of European history might have been very different had not the armies of Napoleon been overwhelmed by the snows of Russia, and had not the ships of the Spanish Armada which invaded England been scattered or destroyed by furious storms. "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name, be the glory," was the cry of the grateful nation at its wonderful and providential deliverance. Yet if we had to rely on oral tradition only for our knowledge of these events, many in our day would regard them as inventions.

It must also be added that in ancient times physical calamities affected a nation's course far more than they do now, because all such visitations as plague, pestilence, and famine were invested with supernatural significance, being regarded as indications of the displeasure of the heavenly powers. Indeed, almost everything in the heavens above or in the earth beneath which arrested men's attention, eclipses, comets, streams of meteorites, thunder and lightning, storms, inundations, volcanic eruptions, monstrous human and animal

¹ Stanley, *Christian Institutions*, chap. xii.

births,—all were of punitive or ominous significance.¹ To placate the displeasure of the gods, to avert the evils which it was believed would follow if it were not placated, a very heavy price was often paid. That a nation at the time of the exodus, terror-stricken by numerous disasters, should lift the yoke of bondage from a people whose God they were persuaded had sent the disasters, whom therefore they desired to appease, is not an event to stagger belief. Where the restraints of religion and law are weak, the first movement of people smarting under great misfortune may be to massacre, if they have the power, those who are the cause of it, especially if the latter belong to a poor, despised race against whom ill-feeling has long been smoldering; “pogroms” still take place in Russia, and in other Christian lands the Jews at various times have been slaughtered for offenses, real or imaginary, against the state. But the Egyptians were restrained by their religious fears from such cruel reprisals. According to their own account, they felt an aversion, a dread of the Hebrews. Pharaoh had troubled dreams concerning them, and the oracles he consulted advised him to send the Hebrews away.² This agrees with the words of the Psalmist, “Egypt was glad

¹ “Cæsar, I never stood on ceremonies,
Yet now they fright me. There is one within,
Besides the things which we have heard and seen,
Recounts most horrid sights seen by the watch;
A lioness hath whelped in the streets;
And graves have yawned and yielded up their dead;
Fierce, fiery warriors fought upon the clouds,
In ranks and squadrons and right form of war,
Which drizzled blood upon the capitol;
The noise of battle hurtled in the air,
Horses did neigh, and dying men did groan,
And ghosts did shriek and squeal about the streets.”

Julius Cæsar.

² Josephus, *Against Apion*, i. 26–34.

when they departed; for the fear of them had fallen upon them."

On broad, general grounds, therefore, there is no strong argument, *a priori*, against the occurrence of the events recorded in the Scriptures. The narrative is consistent in all its parts, and furnishes good and sufficient reasons for the exodus. Passing now to the consideration of the plagues separately, the difficulties which may be encountered are not insurmountable, if the historical imagination be given a little freedom.

THE FIRST PLAGUE.

The waters of the Nile were turned into blood; the fish in the river died; the river stank, so that the Egyptians could not drink of its waters.—In all ages the two scourges most dreaded by the Egyptians have been aridity and pestilence. The first plague seems to have been aridity, as the last was pestilence. The prosperity of Egypt, indeed its very life, depends on the Nile with its annual overflow.

"In the winter and spring it rolls a languid stream through a dry and dusty plain. But in the summer an extraordinary thing happens. The river grows troubled and swift; it turns red as blood and then green; it rises, it swells, till at length overflowing its banks, it covers the adjoining lands to the base of the hills on either side. The whole valley becomes a lake from which the villages rise like islands for they are built on artificial mounds."

The daily rise of the river was measured carefully by officials, who were able from long experience to predict what the crops and budget of the year would be. A high Nile meant abundance of food and general prosperity. A low Nile meant the reverse, for large tracts of land were then left unwatered and unproductive, with consequent dearth or famine and perhaps pestilence, as this in Oriental countries often accompanies or follows famine. The failure of the waters to rise is generally caused by an immense accumulation of vegetable

matter obstructing the channels of the river in its upper courses.¹

The extraordinary death of fish points to a low Nile as having been the first plague, for the waters of a high Nile, though discolored, are not injurious to animal life, but are then most potable. To judge from an ancient hymn addressed to the god of the river, this death of fish when the waters were low cannot have been an extremely rare event:—

“To his house he doth return,
Like a priest for oracles,
Shrinking to his urn;
Cometh forth just when he wills,
From his mystic fane;
By his wrath the fish are slain;
Then the hungry come before thee,
For the waters they implore thee,” etc.

Of similar import are several passages of the Hebrew scriptures:—

“Behold, at my rebuke I dry up the sea, I make the rivers a wilderness; their fish stinketh, because there is no water, and dieth for thirst” (Isa. 1. 2).

“And I will give over the Egyptians into the hand of a cruel lord; . . . And the waters shall fail from the sea, and the river shall be wasted and become dry. And the rivers shall stink; the canals of Egypt shall be minished and dried up; the reeds and flags shall wither away. The meadows by the Nile, by the brink of the Nile, and all that is sown by the Nile, shall become dry, be driven away, and be no more” (Isa. xix. 4, 5).

From these passages it is evident the fish died because of the scarcity of water, its turbidity, and offensiveness.

The plague caused great public distress and anxiety. The agriculturists were dismayed by the prospect of a very poor harvest. The fishermen also lamented, and all they that were accustomed to cast angle into the Nile mourned, and they that spread nets upon the river languished (Isa. xix. 8). The distress soon extended to all classes of the community, for the

¹ Wright, *Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History*, p. 74.

drinking of impure water, the insufficiency of water for household and sanitary purposes, and the odors of decaying fish must have caused much discomfort and sickness.¹ The plague was therefore "the beginning of sorrows and great mournings; the beginning of famine and great death."

How long the waters were retarded we know not, for the words, "and when seven days were fulfilled after that the Lord had smitten the river," do not necessarily indicate the duration of the plague. It lasted until the waters returned to their proper channels by the breaking up or diversion of the "sudd," as the accumulation of vegetable matter is called.²

As to the waters being turned into blood, perhaps the statement ought not to be taken too literally. The term "blood" is often used in a figurative sense in the Bible,³ as indeed in all

¹ Humboldt relates that, in an eruption of Cotopaxi, so many fish of the order *Pimelodus* were ejected that they poisoned the air all round; and it is recorded by Pouchet that near the end of the eighteenth century the town of Bourra was ravaged by a malignant fever, which was attributed to the miasmata arising from the decomposition of an enormous number of these fish vomited by a neighboring volcano (Simpson, *Treatise on Plague*, p. 139).

² In A.D. 1106 there was a period of low water which caused great alarm in Egypt. Whereupon "the Sultan of Egypt sent an envoy with magnificent presents to the Emperor of Ethiopia, begging him to remove the cause of the Nile's failure in that year, and so save Egypt from the horrors of famine. The Ethiopian monarch was ultimately persuaded to suffer a dam to be opened that had turned the river, which taking its usual course, rose three cubits in one day. . . . The envoy on his return received great honors from the relieved Egyptians." (Quoted from the Arabic historian Elmacin by Ward, *Pyramids and Progress*, p. 265; Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 74.)

³ "For the waters of Dimon are full of blood" (Isa. xv. 9). The threat to Pharaoh, king of Egypt: "I will also water with thy blood the land wherein thou swimmest, even to the mountains; and the water-courses shall be full of thee" (Ezek. xxxii. 6). The two witnesses of the Apocalypse "have power over the waters to turn them into blood," and when the second angel sounded the trumpet, "the third part of the sea became blood, and there died the third part of the creatures which were in the sea" (Rev. xi. 6; viii. 8).

literature.¹ In this connection it may simply mean that the water, especially in the irrigation canals, was thick, stagnant, and offensive, as would be the case when the river was very low, and to this extent it resembled decomposing blood. If we are to understand that the water exactly resembled blood in all its qualities; if, in the words of a devout exegete, "from bank to brae the tide of crimson gore swept on, hour after hour, and day after day," then the phenomenon observed by travelers, of the Nile and the Red Sea being turned red by "the presence and inconceivably rapid growth of microscopic animals (*Infusoria*) and minute cryptogamous plants of a red color," is suggestive of a possible explanation.

It is doubtful if the first, or any of the plagues, struck such a blow at idolatry as to weaken its hold upon the Egyptians of that period; but it is quite probable that all of them tended to undermine the popularity and power of Pharaoh. He was to the people their visible divinity, and upon his favor with the gods it was believed the prosperity and happiness of the country depended. So run the inscriptions to the Pharaohs:—

"Thus speaks Ptah-Totunen with the high plumes, armed with horns, the father of the gods, to his son who loves him: Thou vivifiest the inhabitants of the earth through thy commands, King Rameses. I have made thee an eternal king, a prince who lasts forever. I have bestowed on thee the dignity of the divine crown; thou governest the two countries as a legitimate sovereign; I have given thee a high Nile, and it fills Egypt for thee with the abundance of riches and wealth; there is plenty in all places where thou walkest; I have given thee wheat in profusion to enrich the two countries in all times; their corn is like the sand of the shore, the granaries reach the sky, and the heaps are like mountains. Thou rejoicest and thou art praised when thou seest the plentiful fishing, and the mass of fishes which is before thy feet. All Egypt is thankful toward thee."

¹ "Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
Clean from my hand? No, this my hand will rather
The multitudinous seas incarnadine,
Making the green one red."—*Macbeth*.

With a low Nile, the mass of fishes dead, and the prospect of famine, it was hardly possible for the people to rejoice and praise their king.

THE SECOND PLAGUE.

The land infested with frogs.—The monuments of Egypt abound in representations of frogs, toads, tortoises, and serpents, “creeping things” classed together in ancient times. The frog was taken by the Egyptians as an emblem of fertility, and its ideogram in their system of hieroglyphics signified a myriad. So the second plague was not a phenomenon new and astounding to the people whom it afflicted. It was simply one of the natural troubles of the country greatly magnified. Then, as now, “in the height of the inundation, the abounding moisture quickens inconceivable myriads of frogs and toads which swarm everywhere.”

As throwing light on this plague, allusion is sometimes made to travelers’ tales of showers of frogs having been seen in different parts of the world. The foundation of such reports is that after a period of drought showers of rain revivify and bring forth suddenly to common observation innumerable frogs which had lain concealed and torpid in the earth or under stones or other objects during the dryness. An inundation has the same effect, and it also produces the conditions most favorable to the development of batrachian spawn. Hence the old Egyptian belief, often mentioned by Greek writers, that frogs were born of the mud which the Nile fertilized at the annual inundation. The rising of the Nile and its overflow, after the drought of the first plague, led naturally to the second plague of swarms of frogs.

The references to frogs in Egyptian literature are very scanty. One or two of the Egyptian deities of inferior rank were frog-headed. It is probable that religious customs and

superstitions made the plague very hard to bear, especially if the Egyptians regarded, as we know the Hebrews did,¹ the dead bodies of batrachians and reptiles with the utmost abhorrence, the slightest contact, immediate or mediate, being held to carry defilement.

According to the Scripture narrative, when the frogs died, the people "gathered them together in heaps: and the land stank." The defilement of the soil, and the poisonous effluvia from so many dead bodies, doubtless caused much sickness, and the way was certainly prepared for an epidemic. The plague must also have been a trial to those of weak, unstable, nervous organization, many women and girls becoming hysterical, for the frogs were continually being found in the most unlikely places: "frogs in the houses, frogs in the beds, frogs baked with the food in the ovens, frogs in the kneading-

¹"... the great lizard after its kind, and the gecko, and the land-crocodile, and the lizard, and the sand-lizard, and the chameleon. These are they which are unclean to you among all that creep: whosoever doth touch them, when they are dead, shall be unclean until the even. And upon whatsoever any of them, when they are dead, doth fall, it shall be unclean: whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be, wherewith any work is done, it must be put into water, and it shall be unclean until the even; then it shall be clean. And every earthen vessel, whereinto any of them falleth, whatsoever is in it shall be unclean, and it ye shall break. All food therein which may be eaten, that on which water cometh, shall be unclean. . . . And everything whereupon any part of their carcass falleth, shall be unclean: whether oven, or range for pots, it shall be broken in pieces: they are unclean, and shall be unclean unto you" (Lev. xi. 29-35).

The words in these verses denoting animals are of uncertain meaning. *Tzâb*, variously translated as "tortoise," "land-crocodile," "great lizard," etc., may be the tadpole; and *koach*, translated "chameleon," "monitor lizard," "land-crocodile," etc., may be the frog; cf. Arabic *keek*, Greek *κοῦξ*, Latin *coaxare* (Speaker's Commentary). Considering that, to the Jew, frogs were emblematic of the spirits of uncleanness (Rev. xvi. 13), it is more than likely they were included in the list of unclean animals.

troughs worked up with the flour; frogs with their monotonous croak, frogs with their cold slimy skins, everywhere,—from morning to night, from night to morning,—frogs.”

Of this plague and the one preceding it is said, “And the magicians of Egypt did in like manner with their enchantments.” The explanation usually offered by commentators is that the magicians, by sleight of hand or other conjuring trick, imitated the deeds of Moses. It is hard to see how the waters of the Nile could have been altered, or multitudes of frogs produced, by sleight of hand. Others suppose that the magicians were in alliance with evil spirits under the name of heathen gods, and by their aid did marvelous things. This also is unsatisfactory, for with the growth and dissemination of science there is an increasing disinclination to think the devil and other evil beings ever had the influence over the forces of nature which our forefathers believed they possessed.¹

The true explanation of the sorcery of the Egyptian priests is to be sought in the beliefs and practices of religions in their more primitive stages. When knowledge of physical law is rudimentary, and the idea of its steadfast order has not been conceived, men think there is hardly any limit to the power

¹ The great Christian traveler Marco Polo gravely relates that among the Thibetans “are necromancers who by their infernal art perform the most extraordinary and delusive enchantments that were ever seen or heard of. They cause tempests to arise, accompanied with flashes of lightning and thunderbolts, and produce many other miraculous effects.” At the court of Kublai Khan, “the astrologers or magicians sometimes display their skill in a wonderful manner; for if it should happen that the sky becomes cloudy and threatens rain, they ascend the roof of the palace where the grand khan resides at the time, and by the force of their incantations they prevent the rain from falling and stay the tempest; so that whilst, in the surrounding country, storms of rain, wind, and thunder are experienced, the palace itself remains unaffected by these elements.” In British India at the present time there are many natives who credit the yogis with similar powers.

which they can acquire over nature, especially if, by prayers or threats, they can obtain the aid of the supernatural beings who control its forces.¹

¹ To be quite frank, this is rather a difficult subject, for it has always been held in the Christian church, that prayers addressed to God may be effective in changing the weather. In the Prayer-book of the Episcopal Church, for example, are set prayers for fair weather, for rain, and for fruitful seasons. And there is warrant for this in Scripture. "Elijah was a man of like passions with us, and he prayed fervently that it might not rain; and it rained not on the earth for three years and six months; and he prayed again; and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit" (James v. 17, 18). Among the heathen a similar belief in the efficacy of prayer for the same purposes may be held quite sincerely, and, starting from very similar premises, it is not easy to show by argument wherein they are wrong. Livingstone had an interesting conversation on this subject with a rain-maker of one of the South African tribes. Said the missionary, "So you really believe that you can command the clouds? I think that can be done by God alone." The rain-maker replied, "We both believe the very same thing. It is God that makes the rain, but I pray to him by means of these medicines, and, the rain coming, of course it is mine. It is I who made it for the Bakwena during many years, when they were at Shokwane; through my wisdom, too, their women became fat and shining. Ask them; they will tell you the same." "But we are distinctly told, in the parting words of our Saviour," said Livingstone, that we can pray to God acceptably in His name alone, and not by means of medicines." "Truly," replied the rain-maker, "but God told us differently. He made black men first, and did not love us as He did the white men. He made you beautiful, and gave you clothing, and guns, and gunpowder, and horses, and wagons, and many other things about which we know nothing. But toward us He had no heart. He gave us nothing except the assegai, and cattle, and rain-making; and He did not give us hearts like yours. We never love each other. Other tribes place medicines about our country to prevent the rain, so that we may be dispersed by hunger, and go to them and augment their power. We must dissolve their charms by our medicines. God has given us the knowledge of certain medicines by which we can make rain. We don't despise those things which you possess, though we are ignorant of them; we don't understand your book, yet we don't despise it. You ought not to despise our little knowledge though you are ignorant of it." This incident may serve to illustrate the controversial difficulties which Moses had with Jannes, Jambres, and other magicians.

In the religious life of the ancient Egyptians, magic held a large and important part. It was invoked against all the dangers and disasters of the present as well as the future life. It was based on the notion of frightening one god by the terrors of a more powerful divinity, either by prayer placing the person requiring help under the protection of this divinity, or by the person actually assuming its name and authority.¹ The magicians of Pharaoh doubtless spoke in the name and assumed the authority of the gods they considered to be the most serviceable in the circumstances. What was most desired by king and people, one would think, was the removal of the plagues, but the magicians did not attempt this; they were shrewd men and close observers of nature, and, called in when the plagues were only beginning, their incantations—and experience—enabled them to predict the continuance and increase of the plagues, which happened in due course. Thus for a time they were able to contend with Moses.

¹The alleged power of sorcery was tremendous. In the Egyptian Story of Setna, two formulas are mentioned. "If a man will recite the first, he will enchant the heaven, the earth, the Underworld, the mountains and the waters; he will know the birds of the sky and all reptiles; he will see the fishes of the deep, for a divine power will cause them to come to the surface of the water. And if a man recite the second formula, then, although he lay in the grave, he shall take again the form which he had on earth; he shall see the Sun god rising in the sky, and his divine cycle; he shall see the Moon god in his true form which he takes at his appearing." In one conjuration for a woman in labor, the gods are summoned to her help. Should they refuse to come, "then shall ye be destroyed, ye nine gods; the heaven shall no longer exist, the five days over and above the year shall cease to be, offerings shall no more be made to the gods the lords of Heliopolis. The firmament of the South shall fall, and disaster shall break forth from the sky of the North. Lamentations shall resound from the graves, the midday sun shall no longer shine, the Nile shall not bestow its waters of inundation at the appointed time." Absurd as the pretensions of sorcery may seem to us, the multitudes thoroughly believed in them long ago, and great was their fear of sorcery and of the sorcerers.

THE THIRD AND FOURTH PLAGUES.

The dust of the earth becomes lice. The air swarms with insects.—As Egypt abounds with many forms of insect life, and the terms used in the Scriptures have not yet been properly defined, it is not easy to determine precisely the species of insects which tormented the Egyptians in these plagues.

The "lice" were probably the dust ticks which are so common in Egypt. This little creature fastens itself on its victim, sucks the blood, and in a few hours distends from the size of a grain of sand to that of a pea. A traveler writes: "I have frequently seen dry desert places so infested with ticks, that the ground was perfectly alive with them, and it would have been impossible to have rested on the earth; in such spots the passage in Exodus has frequently occurred to me as bearing reference to these vermin which are the greatest enemies to man and beast."¹

The plague of flies may have been unusual swarms of the common house-fly.² The same traveler relates: "The plagues of Egypt were upon us; the common house-flies were in billions, in addition to the cattle tormentor." The latter is a peculiar fly which, he says, invades the country shortly after the commencement of the rains, and tortures all the domestic animals.³ Extraordinary swarms of mosquitos probably increased the general discomfort.

In addition to the bodily torment caused by these various insect pests,—and one must have lived in hot climates to know how severe this can be,—the third and fourth plagues were of evil omen, raising in the minds of the Egyptians the fear of

¹ Sir Samuel Baker, *The Nile Tributaries*, p. 84.

² *Ibid.*

³ This was probably "the fly from the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt" (Isa. vii. 18). In Ethiopia, where the rivers of Egypt are
Vol. LXV. No. 259. 2

pestilence. Only recently have we come to understand the very important part taken by insects in the propagation of infective diseases, and therefore know that such fears were not without foundation. The germs of malaria, a disease common in all parts of the world, and so common in ancient times as to contribute to the downfall of empires, are conveyed from one person to another by the bites of mosquitos. Prior to the sanitary improvements introduced by the British administration, malaria caused a heavy annual mortality in Egypt. The common house-fly spreads such diseases as leprosy, typhoid fever, and occasionally bubonic plague, by becoming laden with pathogenic germs from contact with the sick or with their discharges, and then alighting on articles of food and drink, or upon open sores or wounds. The fleas which infest rats are the principal agents in spreading the plague. Many other diseases of men and animals are transmitted by means of insects.

The old historians were not far wrong, therefore, in holding there was some relationship between extraordinary visitations of insects and subsequent outbursts of epidemic disease. Preceding the Black Death of the fourteenth century, they state the insect tribes were wonderfully called into life.¹ In recent the tributaries of the Nile, the Blue Nile and the Atbara, at the rising of the dog star there comes a terrible fly which drives even the wild beasts from the river banks, and destroys all flocks and herds.

Another instance of certain seasonal conditions bringing into activity swarms of insects is to be seen in the annual but sudden appearance of green flies in Calcutta near the end of the rains. So great is their number that for several nights it is impossible to read with comfort except under a mosquito curtain. They get into the food and drink, swarm around the lamps, and it is impossible to be comfortable for the few nights of their ephemeral existence. The flies disappear almost as suddenly as they come.

¹ Hecker, Epidemics of the Middle Ages.

times, Sablonowski, the scientist who in a measure anticipated the discovery of the plague bacillus, has stated that during the Mesopotamian epidemic of plague in 1884, a species of fly appeared and disappeared concurrently with the plague, and he considers it helped to spread the contagion.¹ In 1902 plague appeared in Australia; fleas were very numerous on the rats during the epidemic, but disappeared when it was over.² It is desired to lay emphasis on this manner of conveying disease, as it will be urged presently that the sixth and tenth plagues were epidemics of bubonic plague.

THE FIFTH PLAGUE.

The cattle in the field, the horses, asses, and the camels are smitten with a fatal murrain.—"Murrain" is a term loosely used to designate several very infectious diseases of the lower animals. As epizootics have been common in all parts of the world from the earliest times, there is no particular reason for doubting the occurrence of this plague. The only difficulty is to determine its exact nature. The most common murrains are anthrax, foot and mouth disease, glanders, and rinderpest or cattle plague. Besides these, countries have their own peculiar murrains. Thus in India, at the present time, there is a disease, called "surra," which every year destroys thousands of the agricultural animals, and causes immense tracts of land to lie uncultivated; in certain districts it has destroyed every horse, sheep, and camel. The description of animal diseases in ancient records is very meager. A writer of the time of Nero, named Columella, records a plague among the cattle of Syria and surrounding districts which seems, from his description, to have been rinderpest. Perhaps the fifth plague

¹ Manson, *Tropical Diseases* (First ed.), p. 153.

² Tidswell, Board of Health Report, Sydney, 1902.

was rinderpest, as this disease has not infrequently visited Egypt, where the natives have always regarded it as the precursor of bubonic plague.

This plague fell heavily on the Egyptians. The destruction of cattle brought ruin to thousands, besides causing general distress from the great scarcity of animal food. Many in their hunger devoured meat which was tainted and fell victims to disease. The offensive emanations from the bodies of dead cattle left exposed, also caused much sickness. All the conditions were such as to promote the development of a widespread epidemic. When plague appeared in Maku, Persian Kurdistan, in 1863, it was noted that the infected district was pervaded with the putrid emanations from the unburied bodies of cattle which had died from murrain.

THE SIXTH PLAGUE.

Men and beast are smitten with boils and blains; boils appeared upon all the Egyptians.—If the boils and blains had affected human beings only, there would be no difficulty in finding among the diseases of Egypt one that might have been the plague. A modern traveler writes:—

“The plague of boils broke out and every one was attacked more or less severely. Then came a plague of which Moses must have been ignorant, or he would surely have inflicted it upon Pharaoh. This was a species of itch, which affects all ages and both sexes equally; it attacked all parts of the body, but principally the extremities. The irritation was beyond description; small vesicles rose above the skin, containing a watery fluid, which, upon bursting, appeared to spread the disease.”¹

There is also the “botch of Egypt” of which we read in the Bible: “The Lord shall smite thee in the knees, and in the legs, with a sore boil of which thou canst not be healed” (Deut. xxviii. 35). This was probably a complaint common

¹ Baker, *The Nile Tributaries*, p. 107.

in many parts of the world, and known in Egypt as the "Nile sores." It consists of troublesome ulcers of the legs which appear about the time of the date harvest in August and September, and, in spite of all that is done for them, last for about five months.

These seasonal visitations, however, do not affect the lower animals to the extent called for by the sixth plague; nor does small-pox, which some writers, ancient and modern, have imagined was the plague. It is a plausible conjecture that the fifth and sixth plagues have been combined in the Scripture record. "If we might suppose the narrative of the plagues to be based on a simpler narrative, which would bear to be treated as matter of fact description, we might expect that in the original narrative, the sixth plague represented the plague proper (bubonic) which is confined to man; while the fifth plague stood for epizootic disease in general."¹

That the sixth was bubonic plague is very probable, but it is a mistake to say it is a disease confined to man. "Nor was it mankind alone that the plague thus harassed as with a scourge," writes Nicephorus Gregoras of the Black Death of the fourteenth century, "but all other animals which dwelt with or associated with human beings who took the disease, dogs and horses and fowls as well, and even the mice that lived within the walls of their houses." Similar testimony comes from many other places where the plague has prevailed. Oxen, sheep, deer, swine, goats, buffaloes, jackals, rats, mice, and other animals have all been attacked by it. Indeed, it is a serious question whether epidemics of bubonic plague in cattle have not been mistaken oftentimes for rinderpest. Yersin, a great authority on this subject, states that without making a bacteriological examination it is extremely difficult to

¹ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, article "Boils."

distinguish the one disease from the other in the lower animals. Others write to the same effect.¹

It adds to the verisimilitude of the sacred narrative to find a murrain in animals preceding bubonic plague in man, for the chronological connection between the two has been observed frequently. In 1842 a severe epizootic in Egypt lasted nine months and was followed by plague, as the people had anticipated. During the famine which prevailed there from A.D. 1064 to 1071, "vehement drought and pestilence continued for seven consecutive years, so that the people ate corpses, and animals that died of themselves; the cattle perished." When the plague raged in Gaza, 22,000 people and most of the animals were carried off within six weeks. An old English chronicle of the plague of the fourteenth century relates that "after this pestilens followed a moreyn of bestis, which had never be seyn." Elsewhere it is said, "The lower animals shared with their masters the affliction of this dread visitation. It was at once a cattle plague, a sheep murrain, and a dog distemper; even the humbler cats and fowls were attacked. In one pasture there died five thousand sheep, and the bodies were so putrid, that neither beast nor bird would touch them. All this abroad as well as in England." So in modern times. In North Africa, India, China, epizootics with a very heavy mortality have preceded outbreaks of bubonic plague.² In the light of these indisputable facts, the conjunction of the two scriptural plagues is very remarkable, and points strongly to

¹ "Many septicæmic diseases met with in animals are analogous to plague in man. From a clinical point of view, the appearances presented by such animals have so resembled plague that Orientals are firmly convinced that epidemics of a similar disease to plague break out among their animals some time previous to the occurrence of plague in man" (Hunter, *The Lancet*, July 14, 1906).

² Simpson, *Treatise on Plague*, pp. 22, 46, 89, 98, 100, 103, 127.

the sixth plague having been bubonic, whatever the fifth plague may have been.

The plague season in Egypt, within the period of exact records, has begun as early as September and as late as January, has reached its height in March and April (the time of the Jewish Passover), and has ended with great regularity, almost suddenly, in the latter part of June.

Epidemics of plague vary greatly in virulency and diffusive power. The medical observers of the Egyptian epidemic of 1834-35 state that the great majority of the population felt its influence, though not actually attacked by it. Those suffering from this *Aura pestilentiæ*, as it was called, had painful glands in the groins and armpits, the pain being usually slight but increased by pressure or movement of the muscles. Other symptoms were malaise, giddiness, want of appetite, etc. Those affected did not cease from business. Undoubtedly this was plague itself, but in an extremely mild form. In the next degree of severity, besides the symptoms just mentioned, there were observed slight feverishness, frontal headache, altered expression of the face, nausea sometimes followed by vomiting, *buboes and superficial carbuncles*, which appeared together or one after the other in different glandular regions. The buboes terminated by resolution, suppuration, or induration. The patients seldom took to bed, and the termination was never fatal.¹ This mild form of plague is known as *pestis minor*. It was the sixth plague.

"Buboes with superficial carbuncles" may well be considered the equivalent of "boils with blains." Terms descriptive of affections of the skin have always, and in every language, been used very loosely. Thus in the English registers of the fourteenth century the external symptoms of plague are de-

¹ Simpson, *Treatise on Plague*, p. 163.

scribed as knobs, swellings, kernels, biles, blains, blisters, pimples, wheals, plague-sores.¹ In some epidemics, there is an eruption of pustules resembling small-pox. The presence of "blains" with the buboes or "boils" may also be accounted for by the fact that plague would find many of its victims among those with "Nile sores" and other cutaneous affections of the lower limbs, for the virus of the disease clings to the soil, whence it readily gains entrance into the system through any breach of continuity of the skin. It has been argued with great cogency that the elaborate pains taken in the best period of ancient Egypt to preserve soil from putrefying animal matters were inspired by the risk of plague, and must have been effective to a high degree.

This *pestis minor* afflicted large numbers of the Egyptians with more or less severity. No rank of life escaped; for, while gaining an easy entrance into the houses of the poor, plague also creeps into kings' palaces. "For whether they differed from one another in dwelling places or in manner of living, or in their pursuits, or any respect whatsoever, so long as the plague prevailed, the differences availed them not."² Many royal personages have fallen victims to it. In the Justinian epidemic, it touched the person of the emperor. King Hezekiah fell sick with it.³ The Assyrian king, Assur-nazir-pal I. the son of Samsi-Rimman, evidently suffered from it, to judge by his address to the goddess Istar:—

"In what have I sinned against thee?

Why hast thou allotted me disease, boils, and pestilence?

Is this thy just decree?

I am broken in pieces, and rest I find not

On the throne of my kingdom."

¹ Barnes, History of Edward III., p. 432.

² Procopius, De Bello Persico, lib. II. c. xxii., xxiii.

³ Biblical Epidemics of Bubonic Plague, Bibliotheca Sacra.

From the remarkable words spoken by Moses to Pharaoh at the close of the sixth plague, it is more than probable that Pharaoh himself was smitten with the disease.

Such an event must have stirred profoundly the minds of the Egyptians. To them the reigning sovereign was the living image and vicegerent of the sun-god. His divinity was proclaimed not only by himself in official documents, but also by his people in their literary effusions, and in works of art even more eloquently than by words.

"... What spires are to a modern city—what the towers of a cathedral are to its nave and choir—that the temples of the Pharaohs were to the streets and temples of Thebes. The ground is strewn with their fragments; there were avenues of them towering high above plain and houses. Three of gigantic size still remain. One was the granite statue of Rameses himself, who sat on the right side of the entrance to his place. By some extraordinary catastrophe, the statue has been thrown down, and the Arabs have scooped their millstones out of his face; but you can still see what he was—the largest statue in the world. Far and wide that enormous head must have been seen, eyes, mouth and ears. Far and wide you must have seen his vast hands resting on his elephantine knees. You sit on his breast and look at the Osiride statues which support the portico of the temple, and which anywhere else would put to shame even the statues of the cherubs in St. Peter's—and they seem pigmies before him. His arm is thicker than their whole bodies. The only part of the temple or palace at all in proportion to him, must have been the gateway, which rose in pyramidal towers, now broken down, and rolling in a wide ruin down to the plain.

"Nothing which now exists in the world can give any notion of what the effect must have been when he was erect. . . . No one who entered that building, whether it were a temple or palace, could have thought of anything else but that stupendous being who thus had raised himself up above the whole world of gods and men.

"And when from the statue you descend to the palace, the same impression is kept up. Everywhere the king is conquering, worshipping, ruling. The palace is the Temple, the king is priest. But everywhere the same colossal proportions are preserved. He and his horses are ten times the size of the rest of the army. Alike in battle and in worship, he is of the same stature as the gods themselves. Most striking is the familiar gentleness with which—one on either side—they take him by each hand, as one of their own order,

and then in the next compartment introduce him to Ammon and the lion-headed goddess. Every distinction, except of degree, between divinity and royalty, is entirely levelled, and the royal majesty is always represented by making the king, not like Saul or Agamemnon, from the head and shoulders, but from the foot and ankle upwards, higher than the rest of the people.

"It carries one back to the days when there were giants on the earth. It shows how the king, in that first monarchy, was the visible God upon earth. . . . No pure Monotheism could for a moment have been compatible with such an intense exaltation of the conquering king" (Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. xxxv).

The Egyptians were therefore thoroughly disheartened by their king's illness. When the emperor Justinian lay sick with the plague, the public consternation was so great as to paralyze all industry, and the idleness and despondency of the people occasioned a great scarcity of food. The consternation of the Egyptians must have been far greater, because of their deeper veneration of Pharaoh. And to them there was no incongruity between his divinity and his sickness. Under the name of god, they did not understand, as we do, a being without body, parts, or passions; the gods are described as suffering from hunger and thirst, old age, disease, fear, and sorrow. They perspire, their limbs quake, their head aches, their teeth chatter, their eyes weep, their nose bleeds, "poison takes possession of their flesh, even as the Nile takes possession of the land." They may be stung by reptiles and burnt by fire. They shriek and howl with pain and grief. All the great gods require protection. Osiris is helpless against enemies, and his remains are protected by his wife and sister. Hathor extends her wings as a protection over the victorious Horus; yet Hathor in her turn needs protection, and even the sun-god Rā, though invested with the predicates of supreme divinity, requires the aid of the goddess Isis.¹ To the Egyptians the king's illness was an appalling sign of the hour and the power

¹ Renouf, *The Religion of Ancient Egypt*, p. 89.

of their great Adversary, and their hearts were troubled and afraid.

What was the effect of his illness upon the king himself? Despite the prospect held before his imagination of meeting the gods in the next world on friendly, almost equal terms, he was probably no more anxious to leave this world than the poorest of his subjects. And the thought confronted him that, after death, he too had to stand in the presence of the "mighty god, the Prince of everlastingness, who counteth his years, who hearkeneth unto those who are in the islands, who raiseth his right shoulder, who judgeth the divine princes," and have his heart weighed in the Great Balance in the Hall of Double Truth. Considering his rank and the times in which he lived, it is not to be supposed that he had the delicate conscience of the Christian, but judging him only by the Egyptian standard of right conduct, what grounds had he for thinking the verdict would be in his favor, that it would be decreed no wickedness was found in him? When he remembered his treatment of the Hebrews he could not honestly plead: —

"In truth I have come to thee, and I have brought right and truth to thee, and I have destroyed wickedness for thee. I have not wrought evil. I have not made it to be the first consideration of each day that excessive labor should be performed for me. I have not ill treated servants. I have not thought scorn of God. I have not caused misery. I have not caused affliction. I have not caused pain. I have made no man to suffer hunger. I have made no one to weep. I have not inflicted pain upon mankind. I have not repulsed God in his manifestations."¹

In all these things his conscience reproved him.

Doubtless the priests offered prayers for his recovery, and performed their rites and incantations; but was not the king's heart softened by his illness, for the time at least, and did he not himself pray for the prolongation of his days to that hid-

¹ Book of the Dead, Introduction to Maati, Papyrus of Nu, sheet 22.

den, inscrutable, and almighty God, in whom the best and wisest of the Egyptians secretly believed,—One who, in that land of multitudinous idols, had neither ministrant nor offerings; who was not adored in sanctuaries, or in shrines with painted figures;—the Lord of mercy, most loving, at whose coming men live? It would seem so, for the king recovered, and hardened his heart, but the heart is only hardened by its wilful resistance to truth and goodness.

In the sacred narrative nothing is said as to the cessation of the plague. In accordance with its usual course, it lasted therefore during the months of winter and spring, subsiding spontaneously on the approach of the hot weather, for it is a disease much influenced by seasonal changes. But in Egypt, as in other countries where plague is a frequent visitant, the epidemic of *pestis minor* in one year is often the precursor of an epidemic the next year of plague in its most contagious and malignant forms.¹ Such was to be the course of events in this series of plagues. Moses comes before Pharaoh, reproves him for his pride and perversity, and then gives stern warning of a second and far more terrible visitation of plague. "For I will this time send all my plagues upon thine heart, and upon thy servants, and upon thy people. For now had I put forth my hand, and smitten thee and thy people with [the full strength of] the pestilence, thou hadst been cut off from the earth: but in every deed for this cause I have made thee to

¹ *Pestis minor* has been observed in Mesopotamia preceding severe epidemics of ordinary plague: in the city of Astrakan in 1877 (the year before the severe outbreak in that province) and elsewhere. (Allbutt, *System of Medicine*, vol. i. p. 928.)

It has been remarked on two occasions in Russia and in Persia, that outbreaks of plague were preceded by a sporadic or epidemic febrile, sometimes afebrile, affection in the course of which the lymphatic glands became enlarged and perhaps suppurated. (Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 150.)

stand [i.e., have raised thee up from sickness], for to show thee my power" (Ex. ix. 14-16; Rom. ix. 17).¹

So the national tragedy is not yet complete. The mills of God are to grind further, and to grind exceeding small. As stated by an old writer, God executed his judgments upon Pharaoh and his people by little and little, giving them place of repentance, not being ignorant that they were a naughty generation, that their malice was bred in them, and that their cogitations would never be changed. (Wisdom of Solomon xii. 10.) This ends the first cycle of plagues; it lasted about one year.

¹The word ἐγείρω is taken to mean, "I have raised thee up from sickness," "I have preserved thee, and not taken thy life as I might have done." This is in all probability the meaning of the original Hebrew, "I made thee to stand." It is certainly that of the Septuagint, which paraphrases the words διατηρήσθης. It is supported also by a reading in the Hexapla, διατήρησά σε; by the Targum of Onkelos, *Sustinui te ut ostenderum tibi*; and the Arabic, *Te reservavi ut ostenderem tibi*. Ἐγείρω is used (1 Cor. vi. 14) of resurrection from the dead, and the simple verb ἐγείρω in James v. 15 means "raising from sickness." (Sanday and Headlam, International Commentary on Romans, on ix. 17.)

ARTICLE II.

THE SAMARITAN SABBATH.¹

BY JACOB, SON OF AARON, HIGH PRIEST OF THE SAMARITANS
AT SHECHEM.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

THE following is the third chapter of a manuscript volume by the High Priest of the Samaritans on the rites and customs of his people. The first two chapters have already appeared in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* (July, 1906 and 1907).

It cannot fall of interest to us to know in what manner the Samaritans observe the Sabbath day. In our New Testament lessons we are perplexed at times to know at just what points the scribes of Jesus' day had enlarged upon the legitimate applications of the Law of Moses to conditions of their own time. The customs of the Samaritans, while they cannot settle, do cast a side-light upon, these questions. They show to us a rigidly Sabbatarian sect; yet with very interesting differences from the customs of the Jews. These differences the High Priest discusses in detail. His treatise is an interesting, and in some respects an important, contribution to the literature of the Sabbath.

WILLIAM E. BARTON.

HOW THE SAMARITAN PEOPLE OBSERVE THE SABBATH.

As to the Sabbath and the manner of its observance and what must be done on it, in so far as the ceremonies current among the Samaritans are concerned, explanations are given in the following pages. Points of difference existing between us and the Jews will be shown to the reader, and substantial proofs will be adhered to convince him that the Jews violate the Sabbath through their unlawful practices.

¹Translated from the Arabic by Professor Abdullah Ben Kori, of Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oregon; edited by William E. Barton, D.D., Oak Park, Illinois.

THE PREPARATION ON FRIDAY.

From the outset every Samaritan individual must prepare himself for the observance of this noble day on Friday, which is the sixth day in the creation of the world, thereby following the command given in the Torah (Ex. xvi. 23) to the effect that the preparation for the Sabbath must be made on the sixth day. On this day all Samaritans procure for themselves, each according to his need and as far as his means may permit, the required provisions for both Friday and the Sabbath, and in such a state of preparation they await the oncoming Sabbath, on which they are commanded not to work. Cleansing of the body and changing the garments are also strictly carried out by them on the day of Friday.

THE ASSEMBLING ON FRIDAY EVENING.

About sunset on Friday they present themselves at the house of worship, where they offer their prayers, which are composed for that time and are of a brief nature, handed down to them from ancient times. With these prayers they are quite familiar, and it must be said that for offering them no more than thirty minutes are required. After prayer, those having food with them may eat it. Thereafter each family comes together (in the house of worship); and, forming a circle, they read portions of the Scriptures, known to them as the Surahs of the Sabbath, containing a memorial of the sabbatical duties, the worship of God (who is exalted) and the blessings due from the observance of the day. This is done after a very ancient custom. Having finished the reading of these surahs, they sing a hymn of most excellent sentiments. It contains thoughts that magnify God (may he be exalted), praises of thanks and gratitude and acts of the humblest adoration.

THE PRAYERS OF THE SABBATH.

This ended, a number of them, desiring to rest, lie down

for a time to rise at an early hour, that the other number may also rest a part of the night, and the reading of the Scriptures may not cease throughout the whole night until one hour or one and a half before daybreak, a short time before the morning prayer. Then the High Priest comes to begin the public prayer, according to the custom which is current among us, and to the rules and regulations which we have nowadays.

Portions of that prayer are taken from the writings of holy men, such as our lords Moses and Joshua (upon them be peace), and the elders of Israel in the days of the pleasure of God (may he be exalted), and from the writings of our doctors and the teachers and bulwarks of our religion. In addition to the foregoing are read therewith various other portions of the holy Torah. The reading is accompanied by appropriate kneelings, prostrations, risings to the feet, and by the uplifting and spreading of the hands. One part of the service is conducted by the High Priest alone, which he reads or delivers, such as preaching, lecturing, announcing, or reading; while the whole people, great and small, stand before him, in their white clothes with white coats, in all respect and devotion, the learned occupying the foreground and the illiterate standing behind, but the priestly family, related to our lords Moses and Aaron (upon them be peace), together with the High Priest, take the precedence of all. The prayer lasts a period of four hours and a half, with the addition of other suitable portions, which are read on a feast day, if such a feast falls on the Sabbath. At the end of the prayer everybody returns home.

THE SABBATICAL DIVISIONS OF THE TORAH.

Now the Bible is divided with them into forty-eight sabbatical divisions, according to the number of the Sabbaths of the year. Every family therefore or tribe comes together, and

reads that portion of the Torah which is designed for that particular Sabbath.

The Samaritan division of the Torah into sabbatical sections is so well defined that it applies both to the ordinary year and to leap-year. Thus for every Sabbath they have a special portion to read, and each portion is divided into several surahs, contrary to the division the Jews have. The Torah is divided by the Samaritans into nine hundred and sixty-three surahs. The one who opens the reading is the oldest member of the family or the most venerable of the tribe. He reads the first surah of that particular portion with a well-known intonation, and with punctuations for each single verse, according to the traditions handed to them anciently from the elders of the days of Blessing unto this day. And when the reader has finished his surah, those present reply with the well-known Hebrew expression meaning "well done, my lord." The next person to him on the right reads the second surah in the same manner, and still the next person on his right reads the third surah, until in this way every one of those present has shared in the reading, to the end of the given portion, in all good order.

THE SABBATH HYMNS.

Thereupon a hymn which belongs to the sabbatical portion is read. It is a composition of our doctors, containing thanksgiving and praise, and is sung with a splendid melody. Food is then passed around, and he who may desire to rest a short time may do so before the noonday sabbatical prayer. Some, however, continue to read until the appointed time for prayer; others go to the house of worship and listen to what may be helpful to them, as given by the teachers of our religion, who received their instruction from the former teachers of our days.

THE MIDDAY SERVICE.

In the meanwhile the time set for prayer is at hand; it begins exactly at six o'clock at noon. The prayers of that time and their requirements are a substitution for both the sabbatical and the daily or continuous offerings. It is among the obligatory prayers with them, together with that of the evening and the morning. The noonday prayer must be made in accordance with a set of rules which are well known and handed to them by traditions.

THE EVENING PRAYER.

After the noonday service has been finished, together with its adjuncts, some of those in the temple go home and partake of their food; others remain, and are given something to eat, awaiting the hour for the evening prayer; for the evening prayer, according to them, begins a half hour before sunset. It is introduced by a short sabbatical prayer, called the Prayer of Departure, in which is made mention of the state of our forefathers of Israel when they were by the sea and the Egyptians were close after them, when, as a result, they were exceedingly afraid. Mention is also made of the state of tranquillity which was brought about by the apostle Moses (upon whom be peace), and his help; for, according to them, this event took place on the evening of the Sabbath, when they left Egypt. They departed on the morning of Thursday and encamped at the sea-shore on Saturday; on this day the Egyptians pursued them and entered the sea on Sunday: so the traditions declare. After this prayer a hymn is read. It is one that was composed by one of their high priests, and contains the qualities and excellences of the day of Sabbath, that it may be observed with zeal for the good reward of those who observe it in worship; and that God may be praised and exalted on that day.

When the prayer of departure is ended, another one begins. It is that of the night of the Sabbath.

THE SEVEN SABBATH PRAYERS.

Now, according to the faith of the Samaritans, the obligatory prayers of the day of Sabbath are seven.

First, the prayer of the eve of the Sabbath.

Secondly, the reading of the sabbatical surahs and their adjuncts, as we have said before.

Thirdly, the morning prayer of the day of the Sabbath.

Fourthly, the reading of the necessary portions and their adjuncts, as we have already stated.

Fifthly, the noonday prayer of the Sabbath.

Sixthly, the reading together of the portions that we have already stated from right to left and left to right, surah by surah, together with the prayer of glorification, exaltations and praisegivings, composed by the wise and most learned writer, the famous High Priest, Merkah. This learned man composed four dissertations for the fourth Sabbath of the month. Each Sabbath has its own dissertation. He also wrote a fifth dissertation, in case the month may contain five Sabbaths.

Seventhly, the Prayer of Departure, which we have also mentioned before.

These are the seven prayers that belong to the day of Sabbath and which it is our custom to perform on that day.

THE ARGUMENT.

On that day, the Samaritans believe that it is not lawful to perform the least work, following the command of the noble revelation, as found in the Torah and of which the explanation may be given later on. It is not also lawful among them to speak about their business, or of anything that may bring profit to them. It is not lawful among them to sail the seas,

neither to leave for the outskirts of the town in which they live. They destroy entirely their fire, beginning with the evening on the day of Friday. They have no artificial light on the night of the Sabbath, and all their food on the day of the Sabbath is prepared for them on the day of Friday, and is kept apart from contact or the influence of fire. On that day they absolutely forbear from approaching their wives or of touching anything made on the Sabbath through fire, whether it be for them or for others. They even avoid visiting on that day with people of a different religion.

They possess, in the books of their instructors and learned men, discussions and thorough investigations as to the differences existing between them and the Jews, with reference to the keeping of the Sabbath.

THE SABBATH ORDINANCES.

Let us now mention briefly, as usual, the various ordinances which this people have for keeping the Sabbath. The ordinances are divided under various divisions and subdivisions.

First, the absolute cessation from labor.

Secondly, the refraining from leaving their homes and going into other places.

Thirdly, the necessity of being pure on that day, both outwardly and inwardly. The keepers of the Sabbath must not expose themselves to what may defile them, whether it be by an act of the soul or of the body.

Fourthly, cessation from labor and sanctifying the time imply that worship must be performed on that day; for the time is fitted for it, yea, even every admonition applied to the fulfilment of holiness must be observed. It is done by reading the Scriptures, by praying, and by sanctifying and exalting the Creator of all things. (Read Num. xx. 12.) As to

the cessation from all kinds of work, we understand the same from the saying of God: "See that God has made for you the Sabbath; therefore let every man among you remain in his place"; also, "Let no man leave his place on the Sabbath, and let the people cease from working on the day of the Sabbath."

Cessation from work is much to be desired for the Sabbath, and is indeed the first essential, but worship is also an essential, and is the fundamental principle of the day.

REST ON THE SABBATH MEANS TO WORSHIP.

To cease from working is necessary, simply for the purpose of worship; idleness has not in itself any praiseworthy element unless the rest is coupled with worship. And keeping the time itself of the Sabbath and magnifying it result in sanctifying the Creator of it.

GOD ALONE GIVES TIME ITS MORAL SIGNIFICANCE.

For the time itself is like any other, had the Creator not fitted it for his worship. Compare "and God blessed the day of the Sabbath and sanctified it;" that is to say he made it fitted and suitable for worship, and it has ever been among the holy days even from the beginning. Time in itself has no energy: it is an effect. The cause is the moving place, which divides it by its movements. God is the prime Creator (may he be exalted), both of the divisions of time and of their moral significance. The undivided firmament, unbroken by a single line or zero point from which reckoning might begin, is the receptacle of time. It is unitary, and has no divisions into days and hours, for time exists outside the planetary system. When the Place¹ was created, and was made to move out, and

¹ "The great Place," as used by the priest, is the earth, with those of the heavenly bodies that, related to it, constitute a measure of time.

was given a certain movement, passing through a certain amount of space, that period which it occupies in making the required definite distance is called time. But, besides the great Place, God (may he be exalted) created others, among them is the sun. Planets pass a certain amount of space around it, turning upon themselves to the extent of a period of a day. Motion was at first from the north to the south, beginning with the sign of Aries and ending with the sign of Libra. From the first motion we have the day and night, and from the second we have the various seasons. God (who is exalted) has established a time of worship in accordance with the days and seasons of the year, that we may know that he created divisible time, and has separated it from the meridian; that he created place and all existence, fitted them for their functions which are voluntarily done. It becomes therefore incumbent upon us to remember his mercies, which are both general and particular, by worshiping him, sanctifying him, and exalting him, which are called the fulfilment of righteousness.

THE HOLIEST HOURS.

It may be remarked here that some portions of the day are nobler than others, provided that worship is to cover only a part of the day. Thus the morning and the evening are the noblest parts of the day. If the worship is to cover the whole day, that day must be entirely made holy, as in case of the Sabbath and the various festival days.

The relations of the place must not also be neglected. Buying and selling must not be done in it. For both time and place in which worship is obligatory must have a peculiar standing of purity.

HOW THE JEWS BREAK THE SABBATH.

On the day of the Sabbath we should not resort to a place

wherein commerce is ordinarily transacted, but which on that day is prohibited by God (may he be exalted), nor to a place wherein live people who do not believe in the Sabbath's nobility and due observance. In this respect our customs are contrary to the conduct of the Jews, who violate the command of the supreme Legislator (may he be exalted), namely, "It shall be a holy day to you in all your dwelling-places." If there be in the place any one who does not believe in sanctifying the Sabbath and ceasing entirely from work, the Jews deal with him, thereby making the place unfit through having intercourse with a man who neither believes nor understands the keeping of both place and time. The command of the supreme God (may he be exalted) must be obeyed. The Jews, however, render null the command, and observe that of Jeremiah xvii. 22, forbidding the wearing of rings on the Sabbath according to what he said, "Do not carry burdens out of your houses on the day of the Sabbath." They prohibit even the wearing of a ring, but make it lawful unto themselves to go out of the town on the day of the Sabbath a distance of about two thousand yards. Do they not render null the command of the supreme God (whose name is exalted), which reads, "It shall be a rest unto you in all your dwellings"? God (may he be exalted) means here that one's movements should be confined only to a place wherein the Sabbath is legally kept, and wherein no work is done, whether it be the exchange of commodities or the coming in or going out for a gain, which in themselves defile the place.

What the Jews do is, therefore, wrong, viewed from all sides, and contradicts the command of the supreme God (who is to be adored), "Let no man go out of his place on the day of the Sabbath." Now the word *Makorm*, meaning "place," signifies both the general and the particular place. It is ap-

plied to the city as a whole or to a dwelling as a part of it. In some cases it may mean either. Then the command of God (may he be exalted) must be kept with reference to the general meaning of the clause, if need be, rather than with the particular, lest in limiting the command to the particular the general may be wilfully violated.

THE SINS OF GATHERING MANNA ON THE SABBATH.

The Israelites who went out to gather manna on the Sabbath committed the following transgressions: they doubted the statement of Moses (upon whom be peace), "To-day you shall not find it in the plain." They moved around and went beyond the lawful places, to which they were not permitted. They desired to gather manna, which is equivalent to the act of seeking gain, as it is said, "and some of the people went out to gather and they found not." They went out to find, and if they had found, they would have gathered, while going itself is prohibited, as we have mentioned above. They were also warned, namely, "You shall not find in the field"; also, "On the seventh day there shall be rest," meaning cessation from work. Therefore those who went out violated several commands.

THE JEWISH SABBATH FIRE.

The Jews also violate the Sabbath through their many unlawful practices, and contradict the will of the Legislator, ignoring his plain purposes as he revealed them. As an illustration: they keep fire in their places on that day, and take advantage of all the benefits accrued therefrom, utilizing it in many ways, contrary to the will of the great Legislator (may he be exalted), that fire on that day should be extinguished and its existence blotted out; that none of its benefits on the Sabbath should be procurable, as lighting, warming, and cooking.

They, however, place the fire within an iron receptacle, as it is their custom, so that whatever they desire to cook they place it in its proper pot over the fire which is enclosed within, as indicated above. They do this, however, before the ushering in of the time of the Sabbath, keeping the same unto the Sabbath, and bringing a union between the fire and its material. But the purpose of the Lord (may he be exalted) is that neither the fire nor its benefits should exist; for the command that prohibits is a sure indicator of the wickedness of what is prohibited.

CONCERNING FIRE KINDLED BEFORE, BUT PERMITTED TO BURN
UPON THE SABBATH.

It is plain that the supreme God (who is to be praised) desires that what he prohibits should not exist, and to bring about its existence is a daring affront to his majesty. It does away with his purpose, and nothing fulfils it except a perfect submission to do away with what is prohibited. Now the Jews think that what the fire does by itself cannot be attributed to another, which is vain indeed! Whatever way be considered as a result of fire is always attributed to the maker of it. For said God (who is exalted), "Let him who made the fire repay fully." If it happened that a man made fire in his vineyard or garden, in order to burn the brush or the like, but, owing to his neglect, it spread of itself and, on a day following the day on which he made it, it burned a fence, or a stack, or something left in a place belonging to some one else, the loss caused by such a fire, even if it were occasioned on the day of the Sabbath and the fire were started on Friday, must be repaired by its originator.

Thus what is prohibited on the Sabbath includes as well the effects of fire, though the fire and whatever may come in

contact with it may have been made before, on a workday. The guilt will be the maker's. The principle is of a general nature. It relates to causes and effects. Any harm that may have been occasioned by water and fire, which are naturally destructive, to a garden or a farm through the carelessness of a man, the responsibility falls on him. The Jews apparently do not understand, and ignore this fact. It is plain that, for everything prohibited, God (may he be exalted) has some reason or purpose; the prohibited thing must be done away with, or its existence provokes God (may he be exalted), and annuls his command. God (may he be exalted) said, "Do not muzzle an ox while it is threshing the wheat." Now God (may he be exalted) desires here that the beast should not be muzzled while it is doing the work, and he who muzzles it before the beginning of the work, and keeps it muzzled while actually in the work, becomes guilty; for the purpose for which the command is given, is rendered null. It is to keep off harm from the beast, and the owner of the wheat is surely not much affected by what the beast may eat. A similar command of God (may he be exalted) follows: "Do not plow with an ox and an ass at the same time"; for by doing so injury to the weaker animal will be avoided.

PURITY ON THE SABBATH.

As to the faithful, he must be pure, for purity is required for worship and is one of its greatest conditions. He must keep the time and the place holy, and himself in the same relative condition, aloof from anything that may defile him. The Jews are short of these conditions, for they dare to approach their wives on the day of the Sabbath, a condition that brings about pollution, according to Leviticus xv. 18. Thus it appears from the reference that either party is defiled throughout

that whole day. God (may he be exalted) chose the time of the Sabbath for his worship, and sanctified it, and chose those who keep it for his worship, commanding them to keep it holy, as it is said, "And the children of Israel kept the rest to perform the Sabbath." The Sabbath is sanctified, "Ye shall keep the Sabbath, for it is holy unto you." But since defilement is contrary to holiness, it must be avoided by the worshiper, who himself must be holy. And, as we said, since the Sabbath is well fitted for worship, and God (may he be praised) made it our duty to worship him thereon, it results that purity is one of the foremost conditions and duties for the keeper of the Sabbath.

Only prayers and worship and the reading of the word of God (may he be praised) can bring about what God (let him be praised) required of the worshiper on the Sabbath, namely, a fulfilment of righteousness and a holy conviction. Read the first few verses of Leviticus xiii., wherein everything which opposes the sanctification of that day is prohibited. The keeper of the Sabbath should not deal nor handle things that may defile him, whether it be in the body or in the soul. Read Exodus xix. 11, whereby may be known about the sanctification of the body and the condition of clothing. It is during three days wherein takes place the preparation for the hearing of the words of God (may he be exalted), and for sanctification and the convocation with his holiness. He called the Sabbath holy in many passages, and made it a sign of sanctification unto all the host of Israel. He appropriated it for himself, that he may be sanctified on it, and prohibited all manner of work in it, making it fit only for his worship. The Jews, however, through their licentious practices and violations of Sabbath keeping, deem it necessary to commit an act which is plainly prohibited, thereby defiling the day of the Sabbath.

THIS IS ALL THAT COULD BE BRIEFLY WRITTEN CONCERNING THIS QUESTION ; THE DETAILS ARE UNNECESSARY.

AND TO GOD BELONGS THE SUPREME WISDOM.

JACOB, SON OF AARON, HIGH PRIEST OF THE SAMARITANS
AT SHECHEM.

ARTICLE III.

PROFESSOR MOORE ON MINISTERIAL TRAINING.

BY THE REVEREND A. A. BERLE, D.D., BOSTON, MASS.

THE discussion on ministerial training and education begun over a year ago in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA has been continued with great zeal and with diversified results in various periodicals in different portions of the country, and the atmosphere is clearing, and there seems to be a definite idea of the modern conditions emerging. The "intemperate" utterances of the original article in this Review seem to have been at least effective enough to make almost everybody aware that the present conditions are impossible and their continuance ridiculous. And on all sides there seems to be a general recognition of the fact. This is a great gain, and it is likewise hopeful that many of the most thoughtful professors and ministers in the country are seeing that the solution of this particular question lies at the base of the whole question of the recovery of pulpit influence and church effectiveness. By far the most notable contribution to the entire discussion is the paper by Professor George Foot Moore of Harvard University read before the National Council of Congregational Churches at Cleveland. This paper, though reprinted in the *Hartford Seminary Record*, has not received the attention which it deserves, although it is in some respects a final utterance on one phase of the question. Professor Moore practically condemns the present system of ministerial training by showing that the ministry being a practical call-

ing, the accent which the present system gives on the training of "scholars in miniature" utterly fails to reach the point. It is worth while in this connection to recall that this utterance is from one of the first scholars in the land, considered by many both at home and abroad the greatest scholar now at Cambridge, and therefore, not at all a person likely to underestimate scholarly attainments and qualifications. Professor Moore says:—

"The ministry is a *practical* calling, like law or medicine; and preparation for it should be directed, unified, and limited by the practical end. Just as it is not the primary end of the law school to produce men learned in the history or philosophy of jurisprudence, but to train men to *practice* law in their own country and time; as it is not the primary end of the medical school to make men learned in the history or theory of medicine, but to train physicians to practice the healing art in their own generation; so it is not the primary end of a theological school to send out men learned in the history and philosophy of religion, but to train men for the practice of the ministry. The choice of studies, the extent to which they are pursued, the method in which they are taught, should all be determined by reference to this end. The teachers in a theological school may serve the same end in a larger way by publications which enable the working ministry to keep up with the progress of their profession; they may themselves contribute to that progress by investigation and discussion; the schools may offer opportunity for more advanced special study to those whose special work requires it; they may make provision for the education of those who are one day to fill professors' chairs; but their chief, and in many cases their sole, proper business is to prepare ordinary men for the ordinary work of the ministry."

And it will heighten the force of these words, if we recall again to the readers of this Review the words of President Eliot which he addressed to the students of Harvard Divinity School as his last word on the motive of entering the Christian ministry. Nothing possibly could show the strength, power, and insight of Professor Moore's words than this extract from Dr. Eliot's address:—

"It must be confessed, however, that in many instances the salary

of a country minister is too small to enable him to educate his family well, keep himself supplied with books and other means of intellectual growth, and acquit himself appropriately in his high function. Therefore, *well-trained young men who possess the needed mental gifts, and who also have some pecuniary resources either by inheritance or by marriage, ought to aspire to the occupation of the country minister, just as well-to-do young men are going into the profession of medicine not so much for the purpose of practicing medicine as of advancing medical knowledge and skill.*"

Here we have in a nutshell a distinction the failure to observe which has been substantially at the bottom of our whole trouble on the practical side, because the failure to note this distinction has, on the one hand, sent out men with a small headful of unworkable scholarship and no adequate sense of the ministerial calling on its practical effective side. It has chained men to an academic ideal, impossible of attainment by most of them, while destroying their chances for practical efficiency. On the other hand it has opened the churches and the pulpits to men with the gift of speaking platitudes effectively, of reciting poetry and anecdotes and dramatic extracts from novels and the like, but whose lack of intellectual attainments of solid quality steadily lowered the tastes, the thinking power, and religious grasp of the congregations. It cut both ways, in fact, because it presented an inefficient set of "scholarly" men, and placed a premium on a ready and more practical set of less soundly trained men. Of course the effective ones of both types survived, and did their work. But it was an impeachment of the very conception of the uses of scholarly knowledge and training itself, because it did not see the relation of scholarship and ministerial service clearly. On this point Professor Moore speaks with great clearness and authority:—

"The minister cannot be expected to possess the special equipment of the philologist, the critic, or the historian. All that can reasonably be asked of him is that he shall understand the methods of

specialists in these fields and be able to use their results, as the practical physician uses those of the anatomist, the physiologist, and the bacteriologist. Throughout his education, the ruling principle must be, not knowledge for the sake of knowledge, but the knowledge that gives power. Even if there were no question of time, we must recognize that the scholar's habit of mind is very different from that of the practical man, and that the cultivation of the former often disqualifies its possessor for the conduct of affairs; so that the prolongation of the period of study in the pursuit of the ideals of scholarship may diminish a minister's effectiveness rather than increase it."

This is wisdom of the first quality, and it is fortunate that a scholar of Professor Moore's standing and character is sponsor for it. This ought finally and forever to dispose of the cry that the demand for seminary reform is "obscurantism" or something worse. Nor will it now be styled a plea from a class of men who deride the value of the most intense and extended theological and philological studies. Is it not about time that the "scholarly" portion of the church proved that its scholarship is practically of more value than the mere exhortations of the often ignorant evangelist who knows nothing but the text of his Bible, but who really knows that? And are we to leave the most effective practical use of the Bible to socialist orators on the curbstones?

Professor Moore points out, too, the two focal points toward which this more effective training of the minister is to be directed, and here his words, especially on the side of ethical training, are of highest worth:—

"Religion demands a twofold interpretation: men want to know, first, what Christianity is, and, second, what it requires of them; or, to recur to the words of the catechism which I quoted a moment ago, What man is to believe concerning God—*theology*, and what duty God requires of man—*ethics*, in a broad sense, personal and social. These two parts of the task are inseparable; the practice of religion depends upon the fundamental religious conceptions; and, on the other hand, worship and conduct powerfully react on those conceptions. Practical Christianity without an adequate and effect-

ive theology would be only a decadent superstition,—a survival of practices when the ideas which gave them vitality and significance had ceased to actuate men, carried on for a while by the momentum of an impulse once imparted, but inevitably running down, because sustained by no continuous power; and a theology which does not produce and maintain a practical Christianity accordant with its fundamental conceptions is doomed to death by its own barrenness.”

“In preparation for this task, the first thing to be attained is a clear and comprehensive understanding of the Christian religion; for a man to assume to teach others what he does not know himself is, to speak bluntly, immoral. The primary sources are the New Testament writings, the teaching of the Master himself and his apostles. To the understanding of primitive Christianity as we find it in the New Testament, the knowledge of the Old Testament, of Judaism, and of the religious condition of the Gentile world in which Christianity was first preached, is necessary. To understand contemporary Christianity, a knowledge of its historical development, especially in the great critical periods, ancient and modern, is necessary. Exegetical and historical studies are not pursued, however, in the practical curriculum, primarily for the sake of knowing the Bible and Church history, interesting and useful as such knowledge is, but of understanding the Christian religion. The historical apprehension of Christianity is itself only a starting point. What Christianity meant to the Apostles or the Nicene Fathers, to the Schoolmen or the Reformers, is from the practical point of view important because it helps us to answer the vital questions, what Christianity essentially is, and what it means to us.”

The social problem of the church and the world comes in also for treatment in this highly interesting paper. The following should wake up a good many people to an appreciation of what is actually going on in the world. Says Professor Moore:—

“The Good World is the ideal of our age. Socialism is inspired by it; the trade unions are striving to achieve at least some of its physical conditions; the modern state is made an instrumentality for its attainment; men of all classes feel a deepened sense of responsibility for the welfare and happiness of their fellows. The good world is, indeed, often conceived in crudely material and eudæmonistic fashion; it is the good world of man's satisfaction rather than of God's purpose, but the ideal is there, however inadequate the conception may be. Nor is this state of things found in Christendom alone, as is sometimes complacently imagined. Buddhism, for example, in progressive lands, is being revived by it.”

And, following on, here are serious words which are nothing more or less than the unvarnished truth:—

“The Christian Church stands at a crisis in its history; it is being put to the crucial test. Will it keep in the front in the progress of humanity, or will it, unworthy of its mission, be left behind, as the Jewish Church once was? The outcome depends in great degree on the ministry, who by their office are the leaders of the organized forces of the kingdom. Will they rise to the higher conception of the mission of the church and of their own calling? Will they have the knowledge, the wisdom, the devotion, the courage, to be real leaders in the struggles of the modern time for human rights, not merely political or legal, but economic and social; for human welfare in the broadest sense; for the honest business, clean politics, impartial justice, social purity, public health, as well as in moral and religious education,—in a word, in the practical interpretation and application of religion? For such leadership the modern minister must be trained. Unless he is to be the blind leading the blind into the ditch, he must have not only zeal of religion and the passion for humanity, but adequate knowledge of actual economic, social, and moral conditions, and of their causes; of the resources which society possesses to make good triumph over evil, and the way in which they may be made effective.”

Nor does the great Cambridge scholar overlook things which have in recent times held a slight place in the esteem of the “scholarly” portion of our ministry, with its wretched pulpiteering, its mumblings hard to understand, its sneerings for the decencies of public speech, and its general contempt of the “platform” style and habit, its nose stuck to a manuscript while the rear seats wondered what it was all about. Let it be remembered, in reading these words, that it is no “cheap rhetorician” who is speaking, but one of the most erudite men in the land. Every preacher and intending preacher in the land may well take these things to heart.

“The modern minister must be an effective preacher, and training for his task demands a large place in his education. It is often imagined that if a man’s head is well stored with knowledge and his heart filled with a desire to do good, he need not give himself much trouble about learning to preach; or that preaching is a talent which cannot be taught. Both errors lead to neglect of one of the most im-

portant parts of the minister's preparation. The training given is not always of the most effective kind; didactic instruction sometimes concerns itself too much with the formal precepts and caveats of style, or the preciosities of phrase-making, the mint, anise, and cumin of 'sacred rhetoric.'

"The fundamental task of the teacher of 'practical theology' is not to give the formula for making a sermon, but to show his students how to translate, or transmute, the facts, truths, principles which they have learned into their practical uses for religious instruction and edification, in the pulpit and out, and into their application to the activities of the church. The inexperienced beginner cannot be expected to make this mediation for himself; he sometimes does not even realize that any such thing is necessary, and pours out in his sermons, now 'higher criticism,' now Biblical theology, now metaphysics, undigested and indigestible.

"Preaching is a form of public speech, and the cultivation of ability to speak forms an essential part of the minister's training. It is not enough that he has something to say that is worth saying; he must be able to say it not only with intellectual and moral impressiveness but with physical effectiveness. The speaker who cannot speak is as bad as the singer who cannot sing. No one is vain enough to imagine that the possession of a good voice, a passable ear, and a song book, will make a singer; but many entertain just this delusion about speaking."

There are other points of importance in this excellent discussion, but enough has been given to show the general trend and purpose of the whole. If this is more "temperate" than the paper in this Review which started this discussion anew, it is none the less drastic and severe upon all who uphold the present impossible system, with its costly results to the church and the ministry. But we are persuaded that light is dawning all around the horizon, and that a new day is at hand. It will not come by cheapening the scholarly quality of the ministry, but by heightening its effectiveness and making it once more the premier calling in the world for influence, power, and uplifting among men.

ARTICLE IV.

THE PREACHER AND THE TIMES.

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM J. HUTCHINS, OBERLIN, OHIO.

As one studies with a preacher's eyes the life of our times, there appears at first much to dishearten him. Our country is spending an immense amount of money upon its ecclesiastical establishments, but the money seems to be expended for the benefit of a diminishing number of church attendants. We look back with envy to the great days of the Puritans, when people actually went to church. Stern old Judge Sewall makes record of a certain Sunday: "Extraordinary cold storm of wind and snow, blows much more as coming home, and holds on. Bread was frozen at the Lord's table: yet was very comfortable at meeting." Nowadays we read long articles concerning the workingman's hostility or indifference to the church. We are continually reminded that the churches are "bric-à-brac." In *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* itself we read of the Rout of the Theological Seminaries, and the imagination conjures up the frightful spectacle of faculties, theologues, and halls all swiftly decomposing into one heterogeneous mass to form some lateral moraine along the margin of the slow-moving course of history. At last a man who honestly cares for the way things are going feels like the old beggar soldier who bore upon his bosom this legend: "Have pity on me. Been in five battles, wounded twice, four children: total eleven."

But just when we have voted unanimously that the world and especially the church and preëminently the seminaries

and the ministers are going to the devil, there appear above the horizon certain facts which compel us to move a reconsideration.

We might refer to certain facts of history. We remember, for example, that in 1803 President Dwight of Yale wrote: "We have a country governed by blockheads and knaves. Can the imagination paint anything more dreadful this side of hell?" Before our day great and good men have sat, raven-like, upon the pallid bust of the mighty past, and uttered their "Nevermore."

We confine ourselves, however, to certain facts of the present, which are not to be neglected in the preacher's estimate of our times. And the first fact, a most hopeful fact, is discontent,—discontent with the existing status. In the industrial world, this discontent reveals itself in strikes and lockouts, in recrimination, in murders worse than those of the Kentucky feuds. Grant that the laboring man is better housed, better fed, better clothed than ever before. He is also better educated than ever before. Greater than ever before seems to him to be the "disproportion between ability and opportunity."

The discontent in matters of religion, technically so called, is less conspicuous but none the less real. While educated Japan throws away her idols for the worship of the Emperor or the worship of nothing; while China casts her gods into the river; while apathetic India is stirred to skepticism of the old systems; religious discontent with us expresses itself in the ceaseless search for some new thing, or in the complete disregard of all organized religion. The appeal to the customary and to the orthodox no longer carries conviction.

As one studies this spirit of discontent, often so crudely, vulgarly expressed, he observes that almost invariably it

is discontent with the unchristlike aspects of our life and thought. Those interested, like the ancient Pharisees, in the maintenance of things as they are, may be eager to deny this. But we believe it cannot be successfully denied.

Another most hopeful fact of our times is the failure of panaceas. Industrial panaceas have been as numerous as the devils in the swine of Gadara, and many of them have driven their possessors into the deep sea. When the panaceas have been most faithfully applied, they have at the best alleviated, they have never eradicated, the real evils of the world life.

The religious world has not been without its panaceas. One Aaron after another has erected his altar, and upon it placed his pet calf of gold, and called mankind to worship: "This is thy god that shall bring thee up out of Egypt." But every one of these panaceas fails, notwithstanding temporary success, because of its inability to deal successfully with the radical problem of all religion, namely sin.

A lost child is brought to the police station. The officers do their best to still his sobbing. Kindly women of the neighborhood come into the station and each tries to console the little one, but without avail. At last a woman rushes in and clasps the child in her arms, and the child is at rest. He cannot tell why. The reason is, he has found his mother. If we interpret aright the present discontent, so deep-seated, so pathetic, this failure of panaceas, they mean this: blind, unconsolated, humanity is seeking her Saviour, and the seeking is prophetic. At last she shall find Him, and in his arms be at rest.

As we note the facts of to-day which must affect the preacher's estimate of the times, we must take into account the new aspiration, the new emphasis, and the new appreciations of the times.

There is an aspiration for brotherhood, which has already manifested itself in a majestic movement.

At the beginning of the last century, when a man from a strange county entered an English village, the inhabitants with one accord set their dogs upon him, not because he was a tramp, but because he was a stranger. To-day the village is learning that the stranger is a brother. In labor circles, men are attaining a very real brotherhood. The class-conscious struggle can be but a passing phase. It is recalled that in the Russo-Japanese War, a group of Japanese socialists sent to their Russian comrades a message of condolence because of the breaking of the bonds of brotherhood incident to the war. We are familiar with the fine brotherhood of men of letters throughout the world. Germany sends her professors to Columbia. Yale sends her President to the German University. All truth wherever learned "at once becomes the property of all men of thought." Ecclesiastical federation is in the air. The missionaries of China and Japan and India are shaming our denominations at home into some semblance of coöperation and unity. The watchwords of the movement toward brotherhood are such as these, Honesty, Peace, Unity, Social Salvation. There have been periods of history when men who uttered such watchwords would have spoken in a vacuum. Surely the world is moving toward the realization of the thought of Jesus, the Preacher's Master.

Along with this new aspiration, there is a new emphasis, an emphasis upon personality. We discount forms and institutions. We are coming to depend upon the man who shall lead, the man who shall lift. One man has recently toned up the work of every branch of the national service, given courage to many a half coward, and inspiration to many a man who has felt himself fighting a losing fight against dishonesty and corruption. We are coming to realize

that Isaiah told the truth: "A man shall be as an hiding place from the wind and a covert from the tempest, as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." What is the meaning of this new emphasis upon personality? Does it not mean that the world is ready to trust, when it shall understand, the personality of the Man, man's best Man, love's best Love, the perfect life in perfect labor writ; the personality of Him who is all men's Comrade, Servant, King, or Priest?

In our times, too, there are certain new appreciations. There is a profound appreciation of Jesus, not necessarily an appreciation of the Christ of orthodox religion, but of Jesus, his character, his teachings, his imperial power in the spiritual sphere. It has well been said that his name is great among the Gentiles. The socialists and labor agitators write books to prove that Jesus was a socialist or a revolutionist. The modern Jews claim him as their own. The churches of Jesus are more and more becoming churches of the Christ-love, churches in which men are led to worship in that best of all worship, the service of men.

With this growing appreciation of Jesus, there is to-day a new appreciation of religion. Revivalists are heard with all the old-time enthusiasm, even when they speak in a crude and unlettered fashion of God and sin and death and the life eternal. "After all," said a friend to Justice Holmes, "the only interesting thing is religion."

Does not the growing appreciation of Jesus, the new appreciation of religion, prophesy the wider and yet wider acceptance of Jesus Christ, until he shall reign King of kings and Lord of lords?

Hugh Black said a while ago: "In this country I find optimism everywhere but in the Church of Jesus Christ."

Is this a time for ministerial pessimism ? Yes, it is answered, because the preacher can no longer effectively serve the times.

It is argued that the magazine and newspaper have supplanted the pulpit in the instruction of the people. We do well to remember the words of a keen observer: "In no country whatever is a genius for public speaking a more useful or commanding endowment than in this." Men do not like to listen to dullards, but they still delight to listen to the man who utters "truth through personality." As contrasted with the speaking man, the written page is pitifully ineffective. It is urged that prejudice against the church precludes the wide hearing of the preacher's message. There is prejudice against the church, but there is little prejudice against the preacher. Crowds will throng the park, mechanics will pack a noonday shop meeting, to hear an earnest man speak of the will of God.

"But the preacher can no longer effectively serve the times, because the higher criticism has shattered the faith of men." It is to be confessed that the last twenty years have been hard years for the younger men in the ministry. The higher criticism has done its work. Good or ill work we may think it. Much rubbish has been removed. The foundations of faith have not been touched. Strong and massive rise the great truths of our religion, God the Father, Christ Immanuel, Saviour from sin, Prince of the eternal life, Founder of the "civilization of brotherly men." What would one have ?

The kindly critic insists that the preacher cannot effectively serve the times, because there is not the old-time respect for the "cloth." No, thank God, there is not. In other days the "cloth" might cover a menagerie of clean and unclean beasts. To-day a minister is respected if, and only if, he hap-

pens to be a man. Then he is granted peculiar honor. Easily the first citizen of Columbus is a preacher, the first citizen of Boston is a preacher. Is not the first citizen of Chicago a preacher? Certainly the first citizen of many a hamlet and town of our land is a minister of Christ.

Has not the preacher's efficiency been seriously crippled by organizations which have invaded the preacher's field? We scarcely need to be reminded that the Young Men's Christian Association, the Social Settlement, and kindred organizations are each the child of the church. Most of them are to-day the willing allies, as they are the constant beneficiaries, of the Church. It is easy for a man to drink of the stream and to forget the source.

Positively: we believe that more effectively than any other man can the preacher serve these times of ours, with their discontents and failures, with their new aspiration, emphasis, and appreciations. The preacher represents the one organization which is set to preserve, to proclaim, and to interpret to our times the word of God. We gladly remember that some of our colleges are now giving instruction in the Bible. But with all their teaching the colleges are directly reaching an infinitesimal part of our population. The Bible is practically banished from our schools.

The preacher too represents that organization to which we must more and more look for the defense of the Christian Sabbath. The state can establish a holiday, but not a holy day. The forces which are now seeking to make Sunday a holiday would soon make it a working day for the masses.

Further, the preacher represents an organization which, growing out of the ideal home, depending upon the ideal home, must ever seek the sanctity of the home. The factory system, the pressure of population and of poverty, the crimes

of the pleasure-seeker, are all working to the destruction of the home.

Let the Bible become a forgotten book, and the discontent and failure of our time will discover to men no Saviour. Let the Sabbath be lost, let the home lose its sanctity; personality will be degraded, the great aspiration and appreciations of our times will shrivel and die.

Our times call loudly for the preacher, for by his very commission the preacher is ordained to be of those who keep the country's soul alive. A German has divided his countrymen into two classes: Stomach-Germans and Soul-Germans. There are Stomach-Americans and Soul-Americans. The minister of the Church of Christ cannot claim the monopoly of the manufacture, but he can claim that it is his supreme task to manufacture Soul-Americans. His study becomes a confessional. Here comes a mother whose daughter has gone wrong, a wife whose husband is a drunkard, a trusted employee who has embezzled from his firm. Here comes the boy who is seeking his way into the service of the world. It is the preacher's work to take the hesitant, faltering hand, and place it in the strong hand of God. In the afternoon he must call upon that aged woman who faces death, and he may speak to her the great words: "He that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die." Then he may go to the hospital, to smooth the pillow of a poor fellow, who has been broken by the wheel of modern life, to show him the fair flowers, which bloom only in the deepest canyons. The preacher comes home to open his mail, and reads the good tidings of a boy whom he has helped to college, or of a traveling man who is fighting the great fight against drink. All the week the preacher is a pastor, calling his own sheep

by name, leading them to the places of God's pastures. Sabbath morning, the preacher, speaking to few or many, makes life for them worth the living, relates the temporal to the eternal, reveals the eternal in the heart of the temporal. A suggestive question is asked by one of our great preachers, "Where does the sky begin?" It is the preacher's privilege to tell his hearers that the sky begins on the earth, that there is no mine of toil so deep, no cavern of sorrow so dreary, but God's sky is there.

The preacher's soul-quickenings work is not confined to his parish. Swiftly conditions in our country change. Into North Dakota in a single springtime flock two hundred thousand people. Foreigners strange to our thoughts herd in our cities. "Across the frontier in the rear," on the East Side, thirty solid blocks are filled with Italians. If the preacher in any measure realizes his high calling, he helps to quicken with the life of God these multitudes, perchance beyond his immediate reach.

As the preacher helps to keep his country's soul alive, he does much to quicken the dead or dying souls of other lands. Very significant are the statistics of those aliens who in the recent days of financial stringency have passed through the outward swinging doors of the republic. They go as missionaries to old Europe, they go at their own charges, and understand the languages, the presuppositions and prejudices, of their hearers. Through their lips to their peoples the minister of Christ may speak the word of life.

Yet more direct is the preacher's influence in connection with that enterprise which Mackenzie the historian places in the foremost rank of those forces which are destined to change the face of the world,—the enterprise of foreign missions. In this country we may ask our Jewish friends

to help us build our hospitals. We may ask our agnostic philanthropists to build our colleges and schools. Our infidel brother will help us care for our blind and diseased and hunger-stricken. In heathen lands, the Christian church, inspired by the Christian preacher, must build and officer every Christian college, care for every species of philanthropy. Who will send forth missionaries to thwart the devil's missionaries? Who will send forth heroes to take the place of heroes who have fallen at their posts? Who will send forth ambassadors of the religion of love, to avert or allay the friction which so frequently arises when East meets West? The vitalizing work of the minister is limited only by the limits of the world.

The New York *Evening Post* is not the organ of the Intermediate Christian Endeavor Society, or of the Theological Seminary. Its recent words have not been too often quoted: "Christianity has been preëminently the preached religion. Inspired preaching has in it the greatest power known to man, that of a kindled personality. It is the most potent fascination, which anything exterior in the church can wield, more vivid than music, more direct than even grand architecture and fit adornment of the temple. . . . We ourselves believe that the dearth of great preachers is only temporary. The high themes are there; the human heart remains the same; the opportunity and the aspiration appeal to lofty natures as of old. . . . We shall once more hear the sincere and moving voices which from the beginning till now have best carried Christian truth into the hearts and lives of men."

The times are on tiptoe for the preacher. Happy the preacher, who, realizing the greatness of his task, is ready for the times.

What kind of man must the preacher be? He must be in the best sense a man of the world. His life must thrill with the life of the times. By the experience of his own heart, he must understand the world's discontent and failure, the world's new aspiration, emphasis, and appreciations. As Schauffler suggests, he must be better acquainted with the church sons than with the church Fathers, more familiar with Jim and Sam than with Origen and Chrysostom. His speech must be the speech of the street, the home, and the heart. He must be the voice of the inarticulate multitude, saying what the world at her best would love to say. A writer has recently used of the true preacher the words of Emerson regarding Lincoln: "He is the true history of the American people in his time. Step by step he walked before them, slow with their slowness, quickening his march by theirs; the pulse of twenty millions throbbing in his heart, the thought of their minds articulate upon his tongue."

But after all there must be a difference. The clerical tie and the reversed collar are somewhat pathetic symbols of a separateness which ought to exist between the preacher and the world; for the preacher, while a man of the world, a man of his times, must be God's man. As God's man he will hold, or rather be held by, certain great convictions. A Japanese minister once said: "I would put into my creed only those beliefs for which I would be willing to die." The preacher must hold certain beliefs for which he would gladly die, for which he believes the world is dying.

As God's man, the preacher must of course be a man of courage. He must be able to understand the experience of which Robertson writes: "Once in my life I felt a terrible night. I knew and I rejoiced to know that I was inflicting the sentence of a coward and a liar's hell." The preacher

may not be one of Dawson's tame prophets bound with chains of gold. No slave can preach. He must have the prophet's heroism, and be willing to take "the prophet's risk." He will rejoice that fate is so bountiful that

"Life may be given in many ways
And loyalty to truth be sealed
As bravely in the closet as the field."

As God's man, the preacher for our times must be a man of divine compassion. We have read somewhere of a man who had only so good a heart as could be made out of brains. God has no work in the pulpit for that man. The Puritan preacher remembers that Jerusalem has sinned, and he pronounces woe upon her guilty life. The preacher for our times remembers the sin, but he remembers also the banishment and the bondage, the harps hanging on the willows and the silenced songs of the exile. He speaks comfortably, straight to the heart of Jerusalem.

Again as God's man the preacher for our times will know in his heart and express in his words the joy of the soldier who marches to victory. What was it made the sad old world listen to the first message of Christianity? It was the joy of the Christians. What gives power to some of the newer sects with their feeble philosophies? It is their note of victorious joy. As the average preacher stands in his pulpit, one asks involuntarily, "Who's dead?" The preacher for our times will have the glorious morning face of the man who has won "the eternal worth while." His will be the jubilant spirit of the apostle, who knew himself a censer-bearer in the triumph train of Christ, spreading abroad fragrance of the knowledge of him in every place throughout the world.

We hear a brother reply to all this: "You don't know my field, the littleness of it and the littleness of my people,

the skeptics and the dyspeptics and the critics." But we have heard of a certain tinker of pots and kettles in a miserable little English village, a man who, lingering in a jail or trudging through narrow streets, yet sojourned in the Palace Beautiful, walked along the heights of the Delectable Mountains, and made his way toward the Celestial City. We have heard of another man, who said, "My garden is very small, but, oh, it is wondrous high."

Fine is the word of the Chronicler: "From day to day came men to David to help him, until there was a great host like unto the host of God." So we see them coming. To the man of the world, who with David has tasted all the deep experiences of humanity; to God's man, convinced, courageous, compassionate, joyous, we see men coming day by day, until there gathers about that man a great host like unto the host of God, men who help him to help mankind.

The days of preaching are coming back. Let the preachers go forth to greet them as they come.

ARTICLE V.

THE EXPERT MINISTER, AND HIS TRAINING OF
HIS LAYMEN.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE WALTER FISKE, OBERLIN, OHIO.

It ought to be a mere truism to say that Congregationalism must be saved by its *laymen*. Theoretically the Congregational Church is a pure democracy, composed only of laymen, with a universal priesthood of believers and no clergy class. Our ministerial dignity is really only the dignity of labor in an aristocracy of service. We are simple, unassuming ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ, not ordained to special powers, prerogatives, or dignities, but set apart to serve. Our ministry is not an order, a class, a caste, but simply an office,—the office merely of a leader among equals.

But we often forget this, and our overappreciative flocks sometimes help us to forget it; for some parsons are born to the cloth, some assume priestliness, and others have priestly honors thrust upon them. All of which is something else. It is not Congregationalism. In the strictest sense, theoretically we are all laymen. But practically we are clergymen. Our doctrine of utter ministerial democracy has become compromised by the common consensus of the character of the Christian ministry, and we are inevitably involved in the interdenominational composite photograph which modern life has put together and expects us measurably to live up to.

If this composite has some features strange to us, such as a Roman collar and a St. Andrews cross, a Lambeth waist-

Vol. LXV. No. 259. 5

coat and a Geneva gown, a Quaker hat, a smooth-shaven face, extra-long and Calvinistic, an Epworth tone, an orthodox unction and a general high-church *ensemble*,—our simon-pure Congregationalism may feel as uncomfortable in such a conglomeration of toggery as the stripling David; but modern society seems to expect us to play the part. Something like this they fancy the professional “elder” to be.

But if we ministers eschew all such accidentals, tags, earmarks of clericalism, and claim merely to be manly men among men, they at first wonder, then welcome, then embrace. The world does like a manly minister. It is merely bored by the professional parson. At present the ministry is traditionally regarded as “in orders”; but rapidly, I apprehend, the layman-minister is coming to his own.

Granted that, according to present standards, we must make a distinction between the ministers as a class, and the laymen; *then* it is far from a truism to say that Congregationalism *must be saved by its laymen*. Ministers have been increasingly regarded as clerics, paid to do the professional work of religion, until in some parishes in the frigid zone they have come to expect the pastor to do all the preaching, all the praying, all the prayer-meeting leading, the hand-shaking and forced smiling; all the parish-calling and sick-visiting, the dear-old-lady-comforting; all the peace-making—and it takes a cruse of precious ointment; about all the money-raising,—in fact, all the routine duties that can possibly have a religious character. If the minister in that kind of a church is not the prince of pack animals, you will have to find it in Missouri! No wonder he is breaking down under such a burden, with the weight of the inverted church pyramid leaning on him, the deacons and the trustees, the “Ecclesiastical Society,” the music committee, the women, the Sunday-school, the young peo-

ple, pressing on *him* for all manner of different duties, until he is flattened out thin.

It was said of a certain old-time minister that he could dive down deeper into his subject, stay under longer, and come up drier than any other man in the diving business. But if profundity was the sin of the old-time parson, we cannot plead guilty to-day. Our failing too often is superficiality, and sometimes we cannot help it. Few of us are in the diving business; we are skimmers. We are obliged, by the multifarious demands upon our time and strength, to spread ourselves out so thin that our blindest friends, with all their charity, can sometimes see the sandy bottom.

NECESSITY FOR LAY COÖPERATION.

In other words, our one-man ministry is breaking down under its burden, in trying to achieve the impossible. The church can never be saved by its one-man ministry; nor, in my judgment, even by a dual or a quadruple clergy corps. The Episcopalian churches in the great cities are doing splendid work, with their multiple ministry; and the Roman Church has ever shown its wisdom and its mercy in multiplying its highly specialized clergy and locating them strategically where they are most needed. But even the multiple ministry can never save the church for its best efficiency. A *layman* ministry, a broad layman service, with subdivision of labor according to special gifts, and with expert supervision by the true bishop, is the ideal for a genuinely effective church.

It will be recalled that this was the ideal of early English Congregationalism. The Pastor and the Teacher in a dual ministry shared the parochial cares, and special duties of pulpit and church functions. But they were aided, and their efficiency multiplied, by a committee of ruling elders, to lead the laymen in religious work.

Robert Brown in his first public statement thus outlines the system: "The Scriptural ordinary officers of such a church are a Pastor, a Teacher, one or more Elders, for oversight and counsel and redressing things amiss, one or more Relievers, and one or more Widows, all to be first tried and then duly chosen." Reliever was evidently Brown's word for Deacon. Henry Barrowe, the more aristocratic of the early fathers, carried this plural, lay ministry still farther, to the verge of presbyterial, but it broke down of its own weight, as too much authority was given the ruling elders, especially in matters of discipline.

The Cambridge Platform (1648) plainly declared that ruling elders were a vital part of the Congregational system, and defined their duties. But meager finances soon reduced the ministerial duet to a solo in most parishes; and ere long the disagreeable duties attached made it impossible in a democratic church to fill the ruling eldership, just as it is becoming difficult to make deacons to-day, unless the title is explicitly avoided.

The above discursus into antiquities is valueless, except to remind us how far from the ideal and the practice of the fathers our modern free churches have strayed, with their clerical ministry and shirking laymen. The situation clearly suggests a broader lay service. The churches must develop more trained, loyal laymen, both as officers and privates, to share many of the pastor's duties and to do countless other things that need doing and thus save the church from ineffectiveness. This idea is the main burden of my message: but, before I define and explain the details of my thought, let me call attention to a neglected function in the Congregational ministry.

AN ATROPHIED FUNCTION: THE LOCAL BISHOP.

Our theory is that all the several names in the New Testament referring to the minister—pastor, evangelist, teacher, elder, presbyter, bishop, etc.—are merely different titles for the same fact, different phases of a common ministry. They are not orders, grades, or ranks of clergy, but all essentially equal, and interchangeable.

The theory is a splendid one; but in fact we have emasculated our ministry by minimizing or losing *the bishop function*. We claim every Congregational minister to be a bishop. It is a fiction. Some are bishops; some are not; according to natural ability, personal initiative, responsibility faithfully accepted. We have largely interpreted this function to mean simply the spiritual oversight of souls, caring for the spiritual welfare of individuals,—and this of course is its most intimate element; but it is not the whole of it. The true bishop is an *administrator* as well as a cure. The foreign missionary and the home mission superintendent illustrate this function better. They are directing the work of many helpers. In many a mission station, a Congregational bishop-minister is overseeing the labors, guiding, instructing, inspiring, the work of twoscore or more native workers, and great efficiency results. The trained minister thus multiplies himself.

Likewise, in the local pastorate in our home churches, the work of the bishop is greatly needed. It should mean more than spiritual oversight, vastly important as this is. Let it mean also the marshaling of lay forces, the training of lay workers, encouraging and enlisting all the church-members who are willing to become recruits in his force instead of mere protoplasm in his field. A revival of the function of the local bishop is what I plead for; in other words, the training and directing of laymen in religious work by *trained pastors*

who are experts in administration. After my emphasis on the essential democracy and simplicity of our ministry, surely no one will imagine that I mean by bishop what the name has come to signify in episcopal churches. We who have prided ourselves on having "a church without a bishop and a land without a king" do not relish the thought of an ecclesiastical autocrat, however benevolent and pious he may be. But even in a layman's church the bishop function cannot safely be abandoned. Only let it be exercised in democratic fashion by a true Pastor-Bishop, fitted by nature and by special training tactfully and effectively to administer the work of a single parish.

I am not overlooking the fact that scores of conspicuously successful modern churches can be cited as splendid illustrations of the application to religion of the principles of modern business, with wise subdivision of skilled labor, conserving of assets and avoiding of waste, with the spirit of eager enterprise, of tactful generalship, and loyal, disciplined coöperation.

But many another church has not yet adapted itself to the new atmosphere. It is still listening passively to the voice of the past, simply hearing things said, and lazily trusting God to get things done. Such churches are ineffective, because, like a crew of workmen resting in the shade while their *overseer* is gone, *they have no bishop*. The bishop function in the pastor has been relegated to innocuous desuetude, overshadowed by the preacher function. It has become atrophied by disuse, while inactive laymen willingly acquiesce.

It may be suggested that it is unfair to blame the pastor for the inactivity or ineffectiveness of the laymen. It does seem unjust. Our sins of omission are sufficient for us, without the burden of others. And it is especially unjust because the ministers have inherited this neglect from the past. In less

exacting times, when church success was relatively easier, under less stress of competition, self-trained laymen were readily found to do the church's work reasonably well. But nowadays our life standards are everywhere raised so high, that in any line of effort—musical, literary, industrial, or religious—people are exceedingly loath to undertake a task for which they are not trained. This is particularly true of urban society, and life in the urban tract.

EMBARRASMENTS OF MODERN CRITICAL TASTE.

People will not ramble on in an inconsequential prayer-meeting harangue to-day, as they used to do. They either have something to say, and say it according to the higher demands of a more critical age, or they keep still. Thus many of them are discreetly quiet. Our silent times that occasionally occur in prayer-meetings need not indicate spiritual decadence. Perhaps they are three parts discretion, three parts modesty, and four parts mercy!

Fairly good musicians will not willingly play at a church entertainment or social now, for fear of this same high standard of taste; whereas, a generation ago, any slip of a girl who could safely wander from the routine of mere finger exercises and scales was willing to exploit her talent before a merciful and patient public. The like clemency was also extended to all grades of "piece" speakers. With perfect immunity from arrest, they spouted and gesticulated frantically, while the discriminating suffered and smiled, and others applauded. It was a merciful age!

Likewise, any pious person, in the easy-going past, was considered a proper candidate for a Sunday-school teacher. But since adolescent psychology was discovered, and the boy problem invented, and the Religious Education Association or-

ganized, and the "higher criticism" revealed, and religious pedagogy given a chair among the sciences, the case is getting quite different. We may interpret the common difficulty of securing Sunday-school teachers, not as unjustifiable shirking, but, again, three parts discretion, three parts modesty, and four parts mercy. People are sensing the demand for experts in this important field of religious education, and they modestly shun the "little parishes of eight," as Professor Merriam suggestively styles them.

People who are highly paid skilled laborers or trained professional men six days in the week—experts at something, anything you please, from baking bread to making a brief—will not willingly enlist on Sunday in the unskilled ranks of church blunderers, without some opportunity to satisfy their own critical judgment and attain their own high standard of service, through some course in expert training.

But meanwhile let it be said, with all deserved appreciation, while the church is waiting for the training of laymen for expert service, the only thing that keeps church machinery running with reasonable smoothness is the splendid self-sacrifice of many devoted laymen, who, though painfully aware of their personal deficiencies, realizing that somebody must do the church's work, are standing by their posts, for the honor of the Christ and the love of his church. All honor and great gratitude to such splendid Christian people, sentinels of faithfulness, though armed, maybe, with obsolete weapons,—those good maiden-ladies who are unskilfully but lovingly handling the boys' classes, breaking cheerfully all the laws of apperception, but sticking to the job with the tenacity of despair, until a trained worker comes along to relieve them. And all honor to the modest, consecrated brother who is willing to "fill in" as superintendent, until a better man can be found,—a man

with a better education, and some special training and experience fitting him for the post.

EXPERT TRAINING OF LAYMEN REQUIRED.

These hints are sufficient to remind us clearly of the arduous duty that is falling upon the shoulders of the ministry, the duty of training its laymen for the increasingly difficult tasks of the church. Many pastors are avoiding it,—some for lack of a definite plan, or real ability to achieve the results; others because of other duties which they fancy are more important or more pressing. Let us avoid the folly of the son of Erin, who, because he had a cord of wood to saw, split, and pile before night, thought he “hadn’t time to file his saw”! It means an arduous task for the expert minister, the pastor-bishop, to stop and train his laymen; but until he does so, he will have to bear most of the burdens himself, which means needless nerve strain and premature age for the pastor, and slow success for a half-effective church. In proportion as ministers realize the possibilities of a coöperating force of trained laymen for transforming a church and dividing a minister’s burdens, will they set about it, at all hazards, and at almost any sacrifice of time and effort, to train their laymen and their young people for the future welfare of the church. Let the Congregational bishop come back; back to the forefront in the pastor’s work, as he selects his best material for helpers, trains them for their special service, and superintends and inspires their efforts. Then, much of the pastor’s time, which now seems wasted, frittered away over trifles, will be saved for other duties, as this detail work is delegated to his corps of volunteer lay helpers, while he multiplies his usefulness through his administrative work, directing the services of the many.

Soon may it be said no longer that the minister is the only professional man who is his own office-boy; that in no other business is a two-thousand-dollar man suffered to do, and do frequently, the work which could be hired done at twenty cents per hour. Not that the minister is above the work, not at all; but it is simply an economic waste. He has more important work to do, like the manager of any enterprise to whom is committed grave responsibilities and only a twenty-four-hour day. Not even the most tireless and versatile minister can work himself in three eight-hour shifts.

The specific needs, in detail, for the training of laymen, are too numerous to be described in this brief paper. The main desideratum is to sense the problem, to feel the pressure of the modern demand, to find the opening for enlarged efficiency for the churches. Let me, however, take sufficient space to outline something of the details of my thought.

The old figure of the parish as the pastor's *field* and *force* is a very vital one. The first year in a pastorate will acquaint a man pretty thoroughly with the needs of his *field*. He will discover the more or less crude human material which he is to work on and with, which must be refined by the living Spirit of God, under his shepherding. He will gradually stumble upon the specific problems that are likely to hinder his success: the forces that are arrayed against the cause of righteousness in his parish; the hindrances and obstacles,—some natural, some human, some inherited from the past, some superficial—easy to overcome, others deep-seated—rooted in prejudice and in bitter grudge and strife; the local characters who are ring-leaders in opposition, or ridicule, or mere social competition. This year's experience will reveal to him the social castes, circles, classes, the gangs of boys and their heroes,

the secret springs of influence bearing reciprocally on different lives, the silken clue which leads through many a social maze and human enigma. He will come to know the secrets of many hearts, the working principles of many lives. He will learn their special talents, capacities, adaptabilities. In short, a year's study of his field, with all the discriminating care of the true sociologist, will reveal to a pastor the objects of his special service, and the subjects, the possible recruits who best can help him accomplish what is needing to be done. He will then be able to select, enlist, draft if necessary, his *force* out of his *field*.

The selection of suitable workers for special tasks is half the task. It requires insight, the prophetic vision, the intuitional knowledge of human nature, and keen sympathy with people. Every successful pastor who is a true bishop has this subtle talent.

Then the grouping of these selected leaders is speedily accomplished; it is always being accomplished,—it runs parallel with other activities in the busy pastorate. Let us mention some of the groups which must be trained, inspired with the pastor's vision and enthusiasm, and prepared for expert service.

DIFFERENT GROUPS FOR SPECIAL TRAINING.

There is, first, the group of older men and women who are the natural leaders in the councils of the church. Often they are surprisingly ignorant of the details of church polity and the methods of procedure at councils, associations, conferences, etc., and often of the proper conduct of local church affairs, or even the keeping of records and membership rolls. Here is the first step for the expert minister, to organize his church intelligently on a respectable working basis, with due regard for decency and order and denominational custom.

Having provided for the present, he next plans for the future. The natural leaders among the young people are diligently trained to assume responsibility as intelligent bearers of church burdens. Pastors' classes for the training of young people are needed both for training *for* church membership and training *in* church membership. Here is keen delight for a true young people's pastor, and the work pays rich dividends. There is hardly space to particularize; but the former naturally includes the careful instruction of young people in the fundamentals of the faith, leading them in the making of their own personal creed, and then guiding them tenderly and skilfully through the realities of an initial Christian experience, as with ever deepening purpose they are led to Christ for personal consecration and are prepared to take intelligently the Covenant of Christian Living.

Thereafter they should be trained to become efficient, intelligent church workers. Various possibilities offer, for personal development in Christian experience, for training in Sunday-school work, further Bible study, mission study in connection with the young people's movement; local sociological study, gathering the facts of the social status of the community, its resources, opportunities for religious and social work, and its special needs. A thorough study of this sort, conducted by the maturer young people, particularly young men, may furnish the basis for more definite church work than has before been done, adapted perfectly to specific local needs.

Akin to this is the training of the older men; and here is the expert minister's most delicate task. Hard-headed business men will not readily grant that the parson is an expert in anything except preaching and praying. They will take his instruction from the pulpit, because the retort courteous is not allowed. They will allow him usually unchallenged opinions

regarding the Bible or other ancient history; but when it comes to modern life, laymen will not often take points from their minister, unless he gradually prove to them that he knows his ground. The presumption is against him; yet they are usually open to conviction.

Nevertheless the church ought to lead public opinion more certainly than it does at present, and exert a positive influence for social righteousness in its local field in definite ways; and this will require the minister's enlistment of his laymen. Most of these matters I believe can best be handled in a discussion class, or privately in the minister's study, with a group of men assembled informally to consult about the facts and plan quietly to get results. This is really Christian training in right citizenship. Often the minister can do better through another party, a man more expert than himself in this field, whose earnest service he can enlist. But the minister must stand behind him.

The time is also at hand when the pastor must become an expert in church finance, and must train his laymen for more businesslike conduct of the business of the church. Of course, where competent laymen are doing this already, and the finances are well managed, the minister may be thankful that his help is not needed. But such churches now are increasingly few. Hundreds of churches are languishing because the finances are so miserably managed. Let the minister master the subject; understand all there is to be known about it; make himself the financial expert of his parish; and then gradually, quietly, train his laymen and encourage them to adopt approved methods for their church. It is too vital a matter to be neglected.

The training of laymen for personal work and Bible-class leadership is something of vast importance and of developing

promise. Laymen are pausing in the rush of business life, to reflect that they are setting the pace for the boys, that they are largely responsible for the moral standards of the young men of their community. The "Big Brother Movement" is steadily gaining ground. The children's courts and the volunteer probation officer system are appealing to consecrated laymen as good common sense. The demand, rightly based on sound pedagogy, that male Sunday-school classes should be manned by men teachers, virile men, busy men, is being met by a hesitating but sincere response, and a growing willingness for service. The more definitely religious phases of church men's club work are coming to the forefront. Men are tiring of the "fun and feed" plan for men's club "work," and are ready for a long advance to more distinctly religious service which will be worth a busy man's while.

But few of them know how. The expert pastor must teach them. This is one of the gravest and most strategic functions of the pastor-bishop. The wonderful success of Young Men's Christian Association Bible classes suggests that men are ready for this sort of work when rightly guided and inspired to undertake it. Herein is the ideal plan for male evangelization.

One of the most important functions of the pastor-bishop is the training of Sunday-school teachers. I have already alluded to it. A higher standard of teaching in the day schools, and a better pedagogy, have made this immediately necessary. The Sunday-school is stagnant now, without trained teachers. It is significant that the slow-moving International Committee have finally felt obliged to launch a plan for teacher training, a two-year course, designed to be reasonably thorough, which teachers may take and become accredited for their work as Sunday-school teachers, with a diploma

certifying their attainments. Here then is a task which the pastors will be forced very soon to assume, except in the few churches where a Sunday-school expert can be hired, a graduate of some School of Religious Pedagogy. It is to meet this vital need that the theological seminaries are quite generally establishing courses in Religious Education.

THE PASTOR: THE CHURCH SPECIALIST.

Many other matters might be mentioned. These I have suggested will suggest the rest. They will differ widely in different fields. *Adaptation to local conditions* should be the constant aim. But whatever may be the specific local need, in every Congregational church there is a distinct need of the local Congregational Bishop, to plan and administer the work of his church. He must be recognized as the *church specialist*. He is the expert undisputedly in Theology and Biblical Interpretation. Let him also be recognized as the expert in administration, in church finance, in religious pedagogy, et cetera. If he is not, let him speedily become such, for it is a vital part of his life business.

An occasional crisis, like a debt-raising campaign or a serious vacancy in his Sunday-school superintendency, or any other special emergency, may demand his personal service in these details which properly belong to laymen, but only once. Let him do it once if need be. Thereafter *he* is to blame, if he does not develop laymen to do this work, training them by the most approved modern methods, with minimum of friction and maximum of efficiency. Just as the efficient bishop, planning for his church's future, carefully trains new leaders and teachers in Sunday-school and young people's work, he should also train a few people of native ability and fitness, to whom he can intrust the details of the church

finances, the missionary interests, the keeping of rolls and records, and the broader denominational relations.

Until pastors attend more conscientiously to this supremely important work of developing and training lay leaders, the Congregational churches will continue to suffer, sometimes irreparably, during the interims between pastorates. But with a force of active laymen in every church not only devoutly consecrated to the work of the Kingdom, but also trained to do the work next at hand, then, pastorless churches will be able to maintain the enterprise aggressively while searching for their new leader, and half the next pastorate need not be wasted in merely regaining lost ground. Furthermore, the power of initiative and self-reliance which the trained laymen have developed in the interim will serve them well for increasing their future usefulness in the church.

Congregationalism can be saved by its laymen. With an expert minister loyally supported by such a force of trained and consecrated laymen, the church will be able, under our only master, Jesus Christ, triumphantly to do its great redemptive and constructive work in the community.

ARTICLE VI.

ESSAYS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM.

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
LINCOLN'S INN, LONDON.

I.

It is often said by supporters of the higher critical hypothesis at present current in many theological schools that the dominant theories are based on the cumulative effect of a vast body of evidence adduced from many different lines of inquiry, and that, if modern scholarship be worth anything at all, the views of the Wellhausen school must be held to be established beyond all possibility of doubt. These contentions are not entirely baseless, although the truth is very far removed from the meaning of those who maintain them. It is the fact that the higher critics have purported to conduct many different inquiries; but it is also the fact that they rarely succeed in making an accurate statement on any subject that has a bearing on their main hypothesis. Indeed, if accuracy, care, thoroughness, impartiality, be essential elements in scholarship—and we apprehend that we shall find much support for the opinion that they are—these men are not scholars. Let there be no mistake as to our meaning. Nothing is further from our thoughts than to suggest that these writers have any consciousness of their own deficiencies. On the contrary, they are all of them sincerely impressed with the (supposed) excellence of the work done by themselves and their friends. They honestly believe that they are careful, accurate, impartial

scholars, and that those who differ from them are either blinded by theological prejudice, or else unacquainted with the facts, or otherwise incapacitated from forming a sound judgment. As they regard their own laborious achievements, they are filled with honorable pride and admiration, and, believing themselves to be great scholars, they naturally fail to realize that any other view is possible.

Nevertheless, as already stated, we have been led to form a very different estimate of these men and their work. While recognizing the transparent sincerity that inspires most of them, we have found on occasions when we have tested their work that an overwhelming majority of their statements on relevant matters of fact were untrue,¹ and to our mind the vast body of evidence adduced only supplies cumulative proof of the incompetence of those who advance it.

It is, of course, singularly easy to bring these divergent opinions to the test. If we be right in holding that an overwhelming majority of the relevant statements made by the critics are untrue, there can be no difficulty (given the necessary time) in bringing home to them such a body of false allegations on matters of fact as shall suffice to convince any impartial observer of their incompetence. We have on many previous occasions dealt with numbers of their allegations in this way. It is the object of these essays to investigate a further batch of their assertions—primarily those respecting the main difficulties alleged in regard to the narrative of the last four books of the Pentateuch—and the analysis which is based on those assertions. To this end we propose to use a book, commonly called the Oxford Hexateuch,² which better than

¹ For an account of some of the causes of this phenomenon, see the *Princeton Theological Review*, October, 1907, pp. 610 ff.

² The Hexateuch according to the Revised Version. Arranged in its Constituent Documents by Members of the Society of Histor-

any other English work represents the position of the Wellhausen school in regard to the Pentateuch, and to deal with the various topics raised in its notes on the narrative sections of the last four books. We shall omit small and unimportant points, and questions which relate to textual criticism rather than higher criticism (so far as these two can be sundered), and we shall supplement that work with other books, especially the volume on Numbers contributed to the International Critical Commentary by Dr. George Buchanan Gray and the commentary on Deuteronomy in the same series from the pen of Dr. Samuel Rolles Driver. The arrangement of the subjects will be dictated solely by convenience. It is not practicable to adhere closely to the order of the commentary, as a single difficulty often affects a group of passages scattered over the Pentateuch, and in some cases other calls on our time make it expedient to defer some of the more laborious investigations for the present; but we hope to deal with every really important allegation as to discrepancies in the narrative of the last four books of the Pentateuch before closing these essays.

To make the inquiry intelligible to those who are not acquainted with the higher critical case, a bald outline of their theory must be given. There were in existence at some time during the Hebrew monarchy two documents denoted respectively by the symbols J and E. Each of these documents must be conceived as the work of a school of prophetic writers rather than as the product of individual effort. A redactor (R^{Je}) combined these documents into a single work called JE, *Iscal Theology*, Oxford. Edited . . . by J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby. 2 vols. London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co. 1900. Mr. Carpenter writes the Introduction and Notes. A second edition of the Introduction (but without the text) has appeared under the name of "The Composition of the Hexateuch" (1902), and will be referred to where necessary.

which cannot always be resolved into its component elements. In doing so he selected portions now of one document and now of another, rejecting whatever was unnecessary for his purpose, and sometimes writing or rewriting a section himself. Later on, the bulk of Deuteronomy was produced by a prophetic school (D). This was combined with JE, yielding JED, and a Deuteronomic redactor (R^d) gave sundry touches to the extant portions of JE. These constitute the total of the prophetic contributions to the Pentateuch. They extend from the early monarchy till the reign of Josiah or later. Side by side with these is a priestly document (P), which is itself composite. The bulk of it is of exilic or post-exilic origin; but it includes the remains of an earlier code, the Law of Holiness, known as H or Ph. A redactor writing in the spirit of the priestly school (R^p) combined JED with P into (substantially) the present Pentateuch, giving some incidental touches to the earlier documents. Each of these main documents J, E, D, and P, being itself the work of a school, is composite, and should be separated into different strata.

In examining this theory, so far as it rests on alleged discrepancies in the narrative of the first four books, we start with Mr. Carpenter's note at the beginning of Exodus; but, for the reasons already given, we postpone the consideration of the questions raised by the revelation of the Name of God and the numbers of the Israelites. In all our quotations from the various writers to be quoted we substitute "the LORD" for their transliterations of the Tetragrammaton, a free use of which is regarded with disfavor by Jewish writers.

EGYPT OR GOSHEN?

"According to J [writes Mr. Carpenter on Exodus] Gen xlv 10 xlv 28 xlv 27a Israel is settled in Goshen, and this view is found

in viii 22 ix 26. . . . But in E Gen xlv 18 [xlv 18?] and P Gen xlvii 11 the Israelites settle in Egypt. There they are accordingly found in close proximity with Egyptian neighbors, from whom they can ask for valuables iii 22 xi 2, or from whose houses they must carefully distinguish their own that the Lord may pass over them xii 13. They are near enough to the capital for the king to communicate with the Hebrew midwives." (Oxford Hexateuch, vol. II. p. 80.)

It has already been pointed out in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA for January, 1907 (p. 12), that J, which places the Israelites in Goshen, regards them as being in sufficiently "close proximity with Egyptian neighbours" to be in danger of stoning (Ex. viii. 26). "Clearly if the Israelites in Goshen were near enough to the Egyptians to be aptly described as being 'before their eyes' and in danger of stoning, they were near enough to borrow jewels when occasion arose. The critics seem wholly unable to realize that the residence of the Israelites in Goshen does not necessarily exclude the presence of Egyptians in that district." It is, however, right also to examine the passages in J, on which Mr. Carpenter relies, in order to see how this supposed contradiction has been created. In Genesis xlv. 10 he prints without comment "and thou shalt dwell in the land of Goshen, *and thou shalt be near unto me,*" etc.; and in xlvii. 27a ("and Israel dwelt in the land of Egypt, in the land of Goshen") he is compelled to treat "in the land of Egypt" as a "harmonizing addition" by a priestly redactor, for no reason save that this is the only method by which a contradiction can be manufactured.

Having thus taken a narrative which regards the Israelites as being settled in the land of Egypt in the land of Goshen, and manufactured a contradiction by garbling Genesis xlvii. 27 and disregarding Genesis xlv. 10 and Exodus viii. 26, Mr. Carpenter is naturally in the position of being able to use this factitious contradiction for the purposes of the analysis. Ac-

cordingly, when he comes to Exodus iii. 21-22, he tears these verses from their context and assigns them to E, because "these instructions must obviously belong to the narrator who regards the Israelites as settled, not apart in the land of Goshen, but among the Egyptians themselves."¹

Again, in his note on vii. 8, in dealing with the narrative of the plagues, he writes: "J has already located the Israelites in the land of Goshen Gen xlv 10 and they are accordingly represented as residing there in viii 22 ix 26; they are consequently unaffected by the flies or the hail. On the other hand, in x 21-23 they are living in the midst of the people in Egypt itself, and their immunity from the oppression of the darkness is secured by the appearance of light in their dwellings. This latter view of their intermingling with the Egyptians lies at the basis of the instructions in iii 21 f and their sequel xi 2 f, and the passages founded on it must be assigned to E." The statement in x. 21-23 is that "there was a thick

¹It is worth noting Mr. Carpenter's method of dealing with iii. 19 f. Having got rid of 21 f. on the ground stated above, he writes: "These verses do not seem in their present form to belong either to J or to E. Not to J because (1) they interrupt the connexion between iii 16-18 and iv 1, and (2) they contain distinct literary marks of E, 'give you leave' and the peculiar infinitive 'to go' [Heb.]. Yet on the other hand the phrase 'by a mighty hand' does not belong to E, but tends to appear in passages kindred with D: for 'wonders' cp xxxiv 10. The passage seems to have been amplified from E by Rje" [*ad. loc.*, p. 84]. That these verses should appear out of place when their proper sequel is removed is of course inevitable. It results not from any impropriety in the narrative, but from Mr. Carpenter's own proceedings. As to his "literary marks," it is interesting to turn up the references in his lists of words. Of "give you leave" it is alleged that it occurs five times in E, once in J in a passage assigned to a priestly redactor, once here, where it is given to Rje, and twice in D. As to "by a mighty hand," the list of words contains five references to JE, five to D, and one to a Deuteronomic redactor in Joshua iv. 24. It will occur to most people to wonder that this sort of argument can be gravely put forward and considered by men who claim to be scholars.

darkness in all the land of Egypt . . . but all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings." There is here no suggestion that these dwellings were anywhere but "in the land of Egypt, in the land of Goshen." Once more this misconception makes its appearance. In the note on xii. 21 we read, "In 21-27 there are traces of different hands blended into one editorial complex. The opening and closing formulæ seem to belong to J . . . though it may be questioned how far the implication that the Israelites were mixed up with the Egyptians can be ascribed to the original J, who places them apart in Goshen." If Mr. Carpenter could only have realized that "in Goshen" does not necessarily mean "apart in Goshen" either in Hebrew or in English, he might have been spared much embarrassment.

THE STORY OF MOSES.

The next charge is as follows:—

"The story of Moses further shows some interesting variations. In *ii* 15 *f* he dwells in the land of Midian, and in 16, 21 marries the daughter of the priest of Midian and has one son 21 *f* cp *iv* 19 *f*. When he returns to Egypt his wife and son accompany him *iv* 20. In *iii* 1, however, his father in law is named Jethro cp *iv* 18, and Moses leads the flock to the mountain of God, identified as Horeb cp 'this mountain' 12. On his return to Egypt his wife remains behind, and when Jethro brings her to her husband she has two sons *xviii* 5 *f*; later on she is described as a Cushite *Num* *xii* 1." (Vol. *ii*. p. 80.)

There are here four distinct charges: (1) in one document (J) the father-in-law of Moses is the priest of Midian, in another (E) he is Jethro; (2) in J Moses has one son, in E two; (3) in J he is accompanied to Egypt by his wife and son, in E they remain with Jethro; (4) in Numbers Moses has a wife who is a Cushite.

We begin with the first charge. The father-in-law is named "Jethro, the priest of Midian," in the following passages of

E: Ex. iii. 1 and xviii. 1. He is named "Jethro" in the following passages of J: Ex. xviii. 9, 10; also in xviii. 2 (R^{je}), to be considered presently. He is called "the priest of Midian" *once and once only* in J, viz. ii. 16.

On this, Mr. Carpenter proceeds as follows: When E speaks of "Jethro, the priest of Midian," he simply assigns the words "priest of Midian" to the laborious gentleman who combined J with E. His only reason for doing so is expressed in the note on iii. 1b. "Some critics think that according to E the father-in-law of Moses was not himself priest. If so, these words must be regarded as a harmonistic addition." Similarly with "Jethro" in J. It is of course nowhere suggested that there is a scintilla of evidence to justify these proceedings. Such testimony as exists of ancient variants is wholly opposed to Mr. Carpenter's theory, for in iii. 1 (E) the Lusianic recension of the Septuagint omits not "the priest of Midian" but "Jethro." But it suits Mr. Carpenter to attribute certain words to convenient redactors; and accordingly he does so, and thereby manufactures discrepancies. So out of the three places in all where "priest of Midian" occurs in the Pentateuch, two go to the harmonist. As to the alleged mental processes of "some critics" adduced as a justification for these proceedings, it will become increasingly clear as this inquiry proceeds what weight should be attributed to them.

Our second "interesting variation" concerns the sons of Moses. It is perfectly true that the narrative in Exodus ii. only relates the birth of the first son, but it by no means follows from this that Moses never had another. In point of fact J proceeds to state (iv. 20) that "Moses took his wife and his *sons*," and Mr. Carpenter only gets out of this by altering the plural into the singular, of course charging one of the indispensable redactors with having changed the text.

His reasons are as follows: "J has only related the birth of one son ii 22, and 25 implies that there was no second. The plural seems to be an editorial reference to xviii 2-4." But if we turn to the note on xviii. 2 we find that the analysis there is justified by the assertion that "in J Moses had but one son, on his return to Egypt, when his wife accompanied him iv 20, 25." The only real foundation for all this is the expression "her son" in iv. 25. From this Mr. Carpenter infers that Zipporah had only one son. But he forgets that, on his own showing, iv. 24-26 is incomplete. He himself believes that it comes from a source more ancient than J. In that case it cannot be taken to prove that J itself knew only of one son. For ourselves we think that there is some ground for holding the narrative contained in these verses incomplete in its present form. Something has perhaps dropped out of the text, and consequently no inference should be drawn from it. If that view be adopted, or if Mr. Carpenter's inference from the expression "her son" occurring in a narrative which he himself regards as fragmentary be rejected, the whole case falls to the ground.

Before proceeding with the other variations charged, it is desirable to deal with the only substantial point that is alleged on the analysis of chapter xviii. Mr. Carpenter states it thus: "In 5 f Jethro arrives and converses with Moses, yet in 7 Moses sets out to meet him" (note on xviii. 2). It is curious how the critics who are always quick to note any variation in the Samaritan or the Versions that can in their opinion be twisted into the service of their hypothesis ignore those valuable aids when they tend to show that the analysis is based on textual corruption. In this instance the Samaritan, Septuagint, Syriac, all read הנה "behold," in verse 6, for the Massoretic אני "I." The editors of Exodus in Kittel's

"Biblia Hebraica" aptly compare Genesis xlviii. 2, where the R. V. (Mr. Carpenter agreeing) renders the Hebrew "and one told Jacob and said, Behold, thy son Joseph cometh unto thee." On that analogy Exodus xviii. 6 would mean "and one [or, according to another possible pointing to the Hebrew, "they"] said unto Moses, Behold, thy father-in-law Jethro cometh," etc. We think this text manifestly superior to the present reading of the Hebrew, and it will be observed how much the narrative gains in continuity if this change be adopted. Another illustration of precisely the same error is afforded by Genesis xii. 11, where the Septuagint appears to have had a Hebrew text reading "I," for the correct Massoretic "behold." It should be added that in xviii. 6, the Septuagint appears to be based on a Hebrew text, which, like Genesis xlviii. 2, read, "And one told Moses and said."

We turn now to the statement that in E on the return of Moses his wife remains behind. This is pure fiction. There is not a word in the passages attributed to E that in any wise supports the assertion. Nevertheless, Mr. Carpenter, having once got it into his head, does not fail to repeat it in his note on xviii. 2, saying, "E, on the other hand, represented Moses as leaving his family under his father in law's care." This is as untrue as the allegation that J placed the Israelites *apart* in Goshen. With the correction of the text in xviii. 6 the whole of that chapter forms an intelligible and continuous narrative, and the statements in 2 ff. that Moses had sent his wife and sons away and that they were subsequently brought to him entirely fit in with all that has gone before. It is not impossible that the original text of iv. 26 told how Zipporah (not the angel) left Moses after calling him a bridegroom of blood.

As to the Cushite wife, nobody knows whether this refers

to a second wife or whether she is identical with Zipporah,¹ recent discoveries having given ground for supposing that there was a Cush in North Arabia; and Mr. Carpenter does not make any serious attempt to rely on this point for the purposes of his analysis.

To sum up: all the alleged variations on which Mr. Carpenter places any reliance are factitious with the possible exception of the inference he draws from the phrase "her son" in iv. 25 in a passage which he himself regards as an incomplete fragment; but we have found that in a kindred chapter there is good reason for supposing that a slight corruption of the text is responsible for a seeming inconsistency in the narrative.

MOSES AND AARON OR MOSES?

Mr. Carpenter's next charge is extremely obscure:—

"In the interviews with Pharaoh one set of demands is urged by Moses alone in the name of 'the LORD God of the Hebrews' iii 18 v 3 vii 16 ix 1 f, 13 x 3; and Moses asks leave to go three days' journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to the LORD iii 18 v 3 viii 27, or serve him vii 16 viii 1, 20 ix 1, 13 x 3, etc. Another formula is found in iii 12, 'serve Elohim upon this mountain,' while in the name of 'the LORD God of Israel' Moses requires the release of Israel that they may hold a feast to him in the wilderness v 1. A third demand is made by Aaron vii 2-7." (Vol. II. p. 80.)

While Mr. Carpenter's grievances are not at all clear, the same cannot be said of his misrepresentations. First, it is not true that "Moses alone" urges one set of demands in v. 3, etc. (J) or that "Moses" (as contrasted apparently with Moses and Aaron) requires the release in v. 1 (E). In v. 1 (E) Mr. Carpenter prints "Moses and Aaron came." In v. 3 (J) he prints "And *they* said, The God of the Hebrews hath met with *us*" (whom?). In v. 4 (E) he again prints "Wherefore do ye, *Moses and Aaron*, loose the people," etc. In v

¹ As will subsequently appear in our discussion of the position of the Tent of Meeting, we think this hypothesis very plausible.

20 (J) he suddenly remembers himself and assigns "*and Aaron*" to the convenient redactor, but he forgets to alter "*unto them*" in the very next verse. In viii. 8, 12, 25; ix. 27 (all J) the redactor is called in, but Mr. Carpenter overlooks the plural in ix. 27 and 28. In x. 3 (J) "*And Moses and Aaron went in unto Pharaoh, and said*" goes to a harmonist, and in 8 (J) the redactor is dragged in to account for "*and Aaron,*" as also in 16 (J); but Mr. Carpenter cannot be expected to remember that in 8 (J) "*unto them*" is also plural, and that in 11 (J) "*they*" were driven from Pharaoh's presence. Once more in xii. 31 (J) "*and Aaron*" is swept away by the usual method, but "*both ye and the children of Israel*" is suffered to remain. Lastly in Joshua xxiv. 5 E is made to say, "*And I sent Moses and Aaron.*" The statement that "*a third demand is made by Aaron*" (vii. 2-7) is also untrue, inasmuch as the passage cited shows Moses and Aaron coöperating, Aaron being his brother's mouthpiece. Further it is not true that a *third* demand is made by Aaron. No fresh information is given as to this demand. It is only the same demand as before. Nor are there two other demands, for there is no difference between asking to go into the wilderness to hold a feast and asking to go into the wilderness and sacrifice. There are abundant instances of sacrificial feasts. As to "*the LORD the God of Israel,*" this is one of Mr. Carpenter's factitious "*literary marks.*" It is used *once*, and once only, in v. 1, and draws from Pharaoh the speech "*Who is the LORD, . . . I know not the LORD.*" Whereupon the explanation is given, "*The God of the Hebrews hath met with us,*" etc. Mr. Carpenter is impressed with the phrase "*serve Elohim*" in iii. 12: does he really imagine that "*Elohim of the Hebrews*" could be used in speaking to Moses or any Hebrew?

At this point it will probably be convenient to deal with the note on iv. 13, which connects with Mr. Carpenter's allegations about Moses and Aaron. It begins as follows:—

"In 13-16 it is not apparent in what way the anger of the LORD expresses itself against the reluctance of Moses. It is believed, therefore, that this is really a later insertion to prepare for the introduction of Aaron, for whom a place had to be found in the story. The want of uniformity in his appearances, the curious alternation between plural and singular verbs in the immediate context of his entry into the narrative (cp viii 8, 12a, 25, 28 ix 27 x 16, 17b with viii 9, 12b, 29 ix 33 x 7a, 18), and the fact that in the earliest extant account of the sanctuary he had no function, Joshua being the servitor of Moses in the Tent of Meeting Ex xxxlii 11 render it probable that the passages narrating his activity are all secondary as compared with the original J." (Vol. II. p. 85.)

The anger of the LORD will be seen to express itself quite clearly in the rebuke to Moses. The "want of uniformity" in Aaron's appearances is made perfectly clear by the narrative itself. Throughout Moses was in the position of God to Aaron, who played a very subsidiary rôle, and in these circumstances an ancient Hebrew could see no inconsistency in using singular and plural almost indifferently. A very curious illustration is to be found in vii. 8 f., attributed to P, who is supposed to exalt Aaron. God says to the brothers, "When Pharaoh shall speak unto *you*, saying, Show a wonder for *you*; then *thou* shalt say unto Aaron." It would be difficult to convey a more vivid conception of the relationship between the two or its effect on the mode of expression than is here afforded. A parallel instance is provided by the plural in Deuteronomy xxxi. 19, in "Write *ye* this song for *you*, and teach *thou* it the children of Israel," spoken (16) to Moses, and again puzzles Mr. Carpenter, who appears to be out of sympathy with Hebrew methods of thought and expression in this matter. Nevertheless he raises no objection to the similar alternations of singular and plural in Gen. xix. 17-19.

The alleged "fact that in the earliest extant account of the sanctuary" Aaron "had no function" needs further investigation, for it supplies one of the most convincing examples of the wholly unscientific procedure of the critics.

THE MINISTRY OF THE SANCTUARY.

Perhaps the clearest account of Mr. Carpenter's views as to this is to be found in his note on xxxiii. 7 (p. 133). "Further, it [i.e. the Tent of Meeting] is not served by the Levitical priesthood, but by the Ephraimite Joshua 11 Num xi 28, whose presence in the Dwelling would have been forbidden under pain of death." Reading this with the statement already quoted that in the earliest extant account of the sanctuary Aaron had no function, it would seem that Mr. Carpenter holds either that the Aaronic and the Levitical priesthood was not recognized in E, or else that it was in some way different from that of P. We say advisedly "it would seem," because there is considerable difficulty in ascertaining Mr. Carpenter's meaning, owing to the inveterate higher critical habit of self-contradiction. On page 114 of Volume I., we read, "The Tent of Meeting, however, when first instituted, needed the service of no sacred tribe. It was not even placed under the care of Aaron and his sons. An Ephraimite, Moses' minister, the young Joshua, was installed as its guardian; and when Moses returned into the camp, Joshua remained within the Tent. Nevertheless E does apparently contain traces of an Aaronic priesthood in the statement that on Aaron's death at Moserah, Eleazar his son succeeded him in the priestly office Deut x 6."

What Mr. Carpenter means by saying in one place that "in the earliest extant account of the sanctuary Aaron had no function," and in another that the same document contains

traces of an Aaronic priesthood, we cannot understand. But his idea that Joshua's presence in the Dwelling when first instituted would have been forbidden under the laws of P is flatly contradicted by the language of that document. In Numbers xviii. 22 we read, "And the children of Israel shall not come nigh *any more* to the Tent of Meeting." No doubt this refers primarily to xvii. 13 (Heb. 28), but it would seem from these passages that the law was thought to be less stringent before Korah's rebellion. Even assuming, therefore, that the Tent in which Joshua remained was in fact a "sanctuary,"—which we take leave to doubt,—and identical with the Dwelling which had not yet been constructed, it does not appear that E necessarily conflicts with P in this respect—even for those who would not admit that Joshua as the minister of Moses probably enjoyed some exceptional privileges.

In order, however, to make it clear that no priesthood save that of Aaron and the tribe of Levi is recognized by E, we propose to go somewhat more fully into the matter. We shall examine, first, the historical position postulated for E; secondly, the evidence of E as to the priesthood; thirdly, its evidence as to Joshua.

Mr. Carpenter, with considerable hesitation, ascribes the reduction of E to writing to the first half of the eighth century B.C. (vol. i. p. 119). Now there are abundant traces of the sacerdotal character of the tribe of Levi and the house of Aaron in the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings. Micah's Levite (Judges xvii.), the house of Eli, Zadok and Abiathar—to mention no other instances—all bear witness to the unsoundness of any theory that might seek to throw doubts on the ministry of the sacred tribe and the family of Aaron.

But the evidence of E itself is still more interesting. Ac-

according to Mr. Carpenter, Deuteronomy x. 6, with its uncompromising statement that "Eleazar his son ministered in the priest's office in his [Aaron's] stead," must be assigned to this document. The blessing of Moses was also "incorporated" in E, and there we read, "And of Levi he said, Thy Thummin and thy Urim are with thy godly one. . . . They shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt-offering upon thine altar" (Deut. xxxiii. 8, 10). Of these passages Mr. Carpenter does indeed seem to have been dimly conscious, but there are others that he has entirely forgotten. The book of Joshua, it will be remembered, is ascribed to the same sources as the Pentateuch, and accordingly E figures there also. The information that may be gathered from a perusal of its fragments is singularly unfavorable. In iii. 3 we read, "When ye see the ark . . . and the priests the Levites bearing it." True, Mr. Carpenter remembers to assign "the Levites" to a redactor, but even that does not dispose of the awkward fact that the narrative of E here recognizes priests other than the Ephraimite Joshua (who is sharply distinguished from them), and that these priests have the custody of the ark. In verse 6 we read, "and Joshua spake unto the priests, saying, Take up the ark . . . and they took up the ark." In 14 we hear again of "the priests that bare the ark." Again and again this representation of the priests recurs (see Joshua vi. 4-9, 12b, 13, 20b). Finally it is E that in the last verse of the book narrates the death of Eleazar the son of Aaron.

It is in the light of these facts that we turn to see what the representations of E as to the alleged "ministry" of the Ephraimite Joshua really are. It does not appear that he was ever in charge of the ark or performed any sacrificial function whatever, nor did he "serve" the Tent. The whole case amounts to this. In Exodus xxxiii. 7, *before* the ark was in existence,

Moses takes a tent and pitches it without the camp *for himself* (so the Hebrew; see Van Hoonacker, *Sacerdoce lévitique*, p. 146, note). This appears to have been a practice—not an isolated act—and from verse 11 we learn that Joshua remained there when Moses returned, as minister of Moses, *not* as performing any priestly function. On another occasion Moses and a number of elders were near “the Tent” when Joshua made an observation (Num. xi. 28). We shall consider what his Tent was when we come to discuss the Tent of Meeting. In this connection we are only concerned with Joshua. It does not appear that he was apart from the elders or that he had any functions to perform except to act as the “minister of Moses,” in which capacity he would seem to have been present (ver. 28). But there is yet another passage in E (Deut. xxxi. 14 f.), and, as Van Hoonacker has acutely pointed out (*Sacerdoce lévitique*, p. 147, note), Joshua, so far from being permanently installed in the Tent, is summoned thither together with Moses. It is therefore patent that there is no justification whatever for holding that the ministry of any “sanctuary” was ever intrusted to the Ephraimite Joshua, or for throwing doubt on the priestly character of the family of Aaron and the Levites in E. The passages relating to the Tent of Meeting will be considered later, but it is already apparent that they afford no foundation for Mr. Carpenter’s remarks as to Joshua.

We return to the early chapters of Exodus. The next alleged criterion for the partition of these chapters is to be found in the rod.

THE ROD.

Mr. Carpenter’s charge on this runs as follows:—

“The rod was one of the ancient elements of the tradition. Here it is represented as the shepherd’s staff which was naturally in
Vol. LXV. No. 259. 7

Moses' hands, and it becomes the medium of the display of the divine power to him. In E it is apparently given him by God 17, and consequently bears the name 'rod of God' 20b (cp 'mountain of God'): as such, it is the instrument with which Moses achieves the wonders vii 20b ix 23 x 13. P transfers the rod to Aaron, and supplies a different occasion for its conversion into a serpent cp vii 8-13." (Vol. II. p. 84, note on Exodus iv. 2.)

We begin by disposing of Mr. Carpenter's comparison. We set out in the form of a syllogism the reasoning which alone could give it cogency:—

(a) "Mountain of God" can only mean mountain given by God:

(b) *Mutatis mutandis*, "rod of God" can only mean the same thing as "mountain of God":

(c) Therefore "rod of God" can only mean rod given by God.

If for any reason the premises be rejected—and we imagine that it will be difficult to find anybody to adopt them—the conclusion falls to the ground. Obviously "rod of God" means nothing of the sort. It is merely a convenient expression for designating the rod which has been the instrument of a miracle. As to the words "take this rod" in verse 17, nobody who reads the narrative of this chapter continuously would understand this as referring to some rod that was given. The phrase is an entirely natural designation of the rod referred to in verses 1-3, and it requires a very captious reader indeed to misunderstand it.

Nevertheless, Mr. Carpenter is so firmly convinced that this rod must have been given by God and was not identical with the rod which had been turned into a snake, that in vii. 15 (E) he assigns the words "which was turned to a serpent" to a harmonist, and justifies himself thus: "A final harmonistic effort (15) identified the 'rod of God' which was expressly

given to Moses for the purpose of working the signs (E) iv 17, 20b, with his own shepherd's staff (J) which had been turned into a snake iv 2 ff." (Vol. ii. p. 89.) As there is not a particle of evidence for the alleged gift, the remarks about the "final harmonistic effort" may reasonably afford much amusement.

But then Mr. Carpenter further alleges that "P transfers the rod to Aaron." So does J. In iv. 30 we read, "Aaron spake all the words which the LORD had spoken unto Moses, and did the signs in the sight of the people." And Mr. Carpenter gets out of the difficulty only by invoking his never-failing help in time of woe—the redactor—to conjure away "Moses" and "Aaron." It is impossible not to feel that he is here influenced by the theory which we have already examined, that Aaron was originally omitted altogether from these narratives.

There is in fact one difficulty connected with the rod; but, as that occurs in the narrative of the plagues, it will be better to postpone its discussion.

THE PLAGUES.

We begin the consideration of this topic with an extract from a paper by the late W. H. Green.

"In reality, however, the plagues form a symmetrical and regularly unfolding scheme, as they stand in the record, without any confusion or derangement. The first nine plagues spontaneously divide themselves into three series of three each.

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. (1) blood, vii. 14-25. | (4) flies, viii. 16-28. | (7) hail, ix. 13-35. |
| 2. (2) frogs, vii. 26-viii. 11. ¹ | (5) murrain, ix. 1-7. | (8) locusts, x. 1-20. |
| 3. (3) lice, viii. 12-15. | (6) boils, ix. 8-12. | (9) darkness, x. 21-27. |

"In each series the first and second are announced beforehand; the third is sent without warning. The regularly repeated formula in the first is with slight variations: 'And the LORD said unto Moses, Rise up early in the morning and stand before Pharaoh,—

¹ In A. V. viii. 1-15, with a corresponding change in the verses throughout chap. viii.

lo! he cometh forth to the water,—and say unto him, Thus saith the LORD (the God of the Hebrews), Let my people go that they may serve me; and if thou wilt not let my people go, behold I'. . . .

"The second of each series is introduced thus: 'And the LORD said unto Moses, Go in unto Pharaoh and say unto him, Thus saith the LORD (the God of the Hebrews), Let my people go that they may serve me; and if thou refuse to let them go, behold I'. . . .

"While the first in each series was thus pre-announced to the king by the river's side, and the second in his palace, the third was wrought without premonition, the LORD simply giving directions to Moses or to Moses and Aaron.

"This orderly arrangement of the plagues is rendered still more significant by their number, which cannot be merely the accidental result of combining separate accounts, which differ both in the number of the plagues and in the substance of the plagues themselves. Nine follow in immediate succession, three times three, suggestive of the three degrees of comparison, each series rising to a climax, the final series the climax of all that preceded; and these are but the prelude to the tenth, which seals the completeness of the whole, like the ten digits and the ten commandments." (*Hebraica*, vol. vii. pp. 131-132.)

Mr. Carpenter's introductory note on the subject begins as follows:—

"The narrative of the wonders vii 8-xi 10 is plainly composite. Various reasons unite to enforce this conclusion; the following analysis is founded on two broad classes of evidence, (α) material differences of representation, and (β) accompanying peculiarities of phraseology. (1) Scattered through the record occur short sections of which vii 8-13 is the type. They are based on the idea of 'showing a wonder' vii 9. Moses receives the divine command, and transmits it to Aaron, who executes it with his rod: the magicians of Egypt then attempt to produce the same marvel, at first with success, but afterwards impotently: the heart of Pharaoh is strong, and he will not listen. These common marks unite the following passages: vii 8-13, 19-20a, 22 viii 5-7, 15b, 16-19 ix 8-12. They are unconnected by any marks of time; they constitute a succession of displays of power increasing in force until the editorial close in xi 10. Their recurring phrases (see the margins), the peculiar relation of Moses and Aaron cp vii 1 f, the prominence assigned to Aaron as the agent of the wonders with his rod cp Num xvii 8, while elsewhere the wonder is wrought by Moses with his rod, justify the ascription of these passages to P. Some points of linguistic affinity with JE are of course inevitable, in travelling over so much common ground." (*Vol. II. p. 88.*)

Reserving for the present the alleged literary evidence, we proceed to investigate Mr. Carpenter's grave misrepresentations on the other points.

First, it is quite untrue that any of the passages cited, except vii. 8-12, "is based on the idea of showing a wonder." In that passage Pharaoh *asks for* a wonder. There is not the slightest hint of anything of the kind in the other passages. Moreover, vii. 9 contemplates the showing of a single wonder, not of five.

Secondly, the allegation that in all these passages "Moses receives the divine command and transmits it to Aaron, who executes it with his rod," is also false. In ix. 8-12 the command is given not to Moses, but to Moses and Aaron. It is not transmitted to Aaron, nor is it executed by him, nor does his rod enter into the action.

Thirdly, the magicians of Egypt are not here stated to have attempted to produce the same marvel.

The relation of Moses and Aaron has already been discussed.

It may therefore be confidently said that this portion of the analysis cannot be supported. Mr. Carpenter's note on vii. 8 then proceeds to effect the division between J and E, partly on the ground of the alleged distinction between Goshen and Egypt (already considered), and partly on the ground that in some passages Moses wields a rod and in others he does not. He writes: "Again the agency by which the plagues are successively induced, varies on different occasions. In one series Moses simply announces to Pharaoh the divine intention, but in another he is directed to stretch out his hand that the visitation may follow ix 22 x 12, 21 (cp ix 29, 33). The hand of Moses wields the rod ix 23 x 13 cp 22 vii 20b, apparently the rod of iv 17 expressly given to him for the pur-

pose" [!] That is to say, no discrepancy is alleged, but in Mr. Carpenter's opinion it was impossible for either J or E to compose a narrative relating a succession of plagues, some of which were initiated in one way and some in another. This was quite possible for P, who is allowed to tell of a number of signs that were initiated by Aaron's rod, and also of one that was begun by the action of Moses in casting handfuls of dust to heaven; but J and E are not as P and must not be allowed the same license. Besides, Mr. Carpenter did not really allow P to do this. He shut his eyes to P's actions and alleged that he had done something else. Hence he cannot conceive such conduct in J or E.

With regard to "the rod of iv 17 expressly given to him for the purpose" we must recall the fact that Mr. Carpenter is able to make this out only by banishing from vii. 15 the phrase which proves this to be the rod that was turned into a serpent. We have already discussed the alleged gift, but we have now to see how the rod is eliminated from J. Mr. Carpenter continues: "The coincidence of (i) [i.e. the presence in Egypt, not Goshen] and (ii) [i.e. the rod] in x 21-23 secures all the rod-passages to E. It will be noticed that these contain no mention of Aaron; Moses throughout appears alone; act after act follows without recorded speech." We have already dealt with the presence of Aaron in E. It will be noticed that the assignment of the rod-passages to E rests on nothing more secure than the theory that residence in Goshen excludes the proximity of Egyptians. It need only be added that the other statements are simply due to the arbitrary division adopted. Thus x. 28 f. are assigned to J without so much as a pretense that there is any reason for it, though the preceding verse is given to E. Any narrative in the world could be divided on these principles.

It remains to notice the other points as to material representation on the narrative of the plagues. We read in vii. 25, "And seven days were fulfilled, after that the LORD had smitten the river." On the strength of this, Mr. Carpenter writes as follows in his note on 14a: "In the formula 'Thus saith the LORD . . . Behold I will smite,' the LORD is obviously the subject of the verb cp viii 1 f, 20 f ix 13, 18 x 3 f, and it is plain from 25 that the writer conceived of the LORD as himself smiting the river [!], with the result that the fish died (18, 21), and the Egyptians could not drink the water." (Vol. ii. p. 89.) And this man apparently conceives that he is qualified to act as a *literary* critic!

The next point is not less marvelous. In ix. 6 we read that "all the cattle of Egypt died." By the context (verse 3) this is in effect limited to the cattle in the field, but Mr. Carpenter is not in the habit of attending to the context of any statement, and it pleases him, moreover, to treat "all" as a mathematical term. Therefore on 19 he gravely prints the following: "According to ix 6 'the cattle of Egypt' are already all dead, and in 25b, consequently, the destructive effect of the hail is limited to trees and herbs [Mr. Carpenter achieves this by giving the first half of 25 to E and the second to J]. The prediction of the death of the cattle which should be exposed to the storm, must therefore be regarded as an editorial afterthought in reference to 25a." And on verse 22: "When it is further added 'that there may be hail on man and *upon* *beast* throughout the land of Egypt,' it becomes plain that this passage cannot proceed from the writer of 6!" Hence again in xi 5 we are told that "and all the firstborn of cattle" is "probably a late editorial addition. The 'cattle' of Egypt (מקנה) had already been killed ix 6; the term here employed, 'beast,' as in xiii 12, 15, suggests the presence of the harmonizer, anx-

ious to find a basis for legal usage in the sacred tradition." (Vol. ii. p. 96.) Similarly with xii. 29. We are surprised that Mr. Carpenter does not on the same principle argue that ix. 14 must relate to the introduction of the story of the plagues on the ground that God speaks of sending "all" his plagues. Similarly Dr. G. B. Gray argues that Numbers xxxi. must be unhistorical, because (amongst other reasons) "if it were historical, then, since *every* male Midianite was slain, Midian must have disappeared from history in the time of Moses; and this conclusion would conflict with the prominent part played by Midian in the Book of Judges (vi.-viii.), not to speak of later references [!]." (Numbers, pp. 418-419.) And Dr. Baentsch, the author of another higher critical commentary on Numbers, thinks it necessary to point out solemnly on verse 7 (every male), that, according to verse 17, the male children were not included in this! We can only express the hope that a time may come when some sympathy with the Hebrew genius and its methods of expression may be deemed an indispensable precondition to the task of producing a commentary on a Hebrew book.

There thus remains *one* difficulty in the narrative of the plagues. In Exodus vii. 17 God in speaking to Moses commands him to say, "Behold I will smite with the rod that is in *mine* hand"; whereas, in 19, He says, "Say unto Aaron, Take *thy* rod," etc. The passages are certainly not incapable of being harmonized, but there is perhaps a little awkwardness in the phrase "take thy rod," which would disappear if, for example, "take *the* rod" could be read. It is of course not impossible that there is some slight corruption in the text, and that it has been emended on the basis of verse 8, where the phrase is decidedly in place; but no variant is recorded in Kittel's "Biblia Hebraica." The editions of the

Septuagint by Swete and Lagarde give no help: and the Samaritan text is here manifestly inferior. On the whole, we are of the opinion that different minds will be likely to take different views, some holding that the text is correct as it stands, while others may favor some hypothesis of corruption. In any case the awkwardness here is the only point we have discovered in the narrative of the plagues that can be reasonably held to create any difficulty at all.

By the means we have considered, Mr. Carpenter produces the following table of the plagues (vol. ii. p. 89), which should be carefully contrasted with Dr. Green's table given above.

J	E	P
The river smitten, death of the fish	Waters of the river turned to blood.	Aaron's rod changed to a serpent. Waters of Egypt turned to blood.
Frogs		Frogs
Flies		Lice
Murrain		
Hail	Hail	Bolls
Locusts	Locusts	
	Darkness	
Death of the first-born	[Death of the first- born]	Death of the first- born

It is to be noticed that no system whatever is traceable either in the number of the plagues, or in the method of their execution or their significance, or in the relation of the documents to one another. In Mr. Carpenter's scheme we simply have aimless collections of fragments—nothing more.

THE SO-CALLED LITERARY EVIDENCE.

Nothing is more astonishing in the higher criticism than the arguments which by a desecration of language are termed "literary." Literary criticism cannot exist apart from literary feeling, and it takes but a very few minutes to see that this quality is entirely absent from the higher critical work. It

would be difficult to conceive anything more hopelessly unliterary than the evidence produced under this head. And it must be remembered that the lists of words adduced are further vitiated by the characteristics that we have seen at work in the statements as to material differences—the lack of care, accuracy, thoroughness, judgment, and impartiality that constitute the outstanding features of all the higher critical work. Opening Volume I. of the Oxford Hexateuch at random at the lists of words, we take two or three instances from the page (187) on which we happened to light. The phrases are alleged to be characteristic of J:—No. 34, “flowing with milk and honey”—said to be used 8 times by J, 7 times by D and once by P^h (the Holiness legislation—a separate code now incorporated in P); No. 36, “from the time that,” 4 J, 1 R^d; No. 38, “to do good,” 9 J, 2 E, 10 D, 2 P; and so on. This sort of thing is mere trifling. If a phrase can be used by any two or three or four of the alleged documents and redactors, it is obvious that there is nothing distinctive about it. And in estimating these lists other considerations must also be borne in mind. It quite frequently happens that the division of the documents by various critics is not identical. In such cases the lists of words break down. Again, there is much circular reasoning. The critics will say that a particular source uses a given word, and adduce, in triumphant justification of their dictum, passages which have been attributed to that source only on the ground of the occurrence of this very word. To take an illustration: in Exodus iii. 19 we find a particular use of the infinitive. This is assigned by the editors of the new English edition of Gesenius’s Hebrew lexicon to J, but by Mr. Carpenter to a redactor on the ground partly that this is an E phrase. Then this phrase is quoted in the E list of words to distinguish E from other documents. Moreover, redactors are

perpetually called in to account for unpleasant facts. Indeed, it may safely be said that the allegations as to the literary evidence are quite as unreliable as the other assertions of the critics. We have recently treated of the question at some length in the *Princeton Theological Review* for October, 1907, and we do not propose to enter at all fully into the matter in these essays, but Mr. Carpenter's table in the note on vii. 8 may be given as a fair example.

J	E	P
Pharaoh 'refuses to let the people go' vii 14 viii 2 ix 2 x 4.		
'The LORD, God of the Hebrews,' vii 16 ix 1, 13 x 3.		'Say unto Aaron' vii 9, 19 viii 5, 16. The magicians vii 11, 22 viii 7, 18 ix 11.
'Let my people go that they may serve me' vii 16 viii 1, 20 ix 1, 13 x 3.		
'Thus saith the LORD . . . Behold I will . . . ' vii 17 viii 1 f, 20 f ix 1 (3), 13, 18 x 3 f.	Moses stretches out his hand with the rod vii 15, 20b ix 22 f x 12 f, 21 f.	Aaron stretches out his hand with his rod vii 9, 19 viii 5 f, 16 f.
'Intreat the LORD' viii 8, 28 ix 28 x 17.		Land of Egypt vii 19, 21b viii 5-7, 16 f ix 9ab xii 1, 12 f, 17, 41 f, 51.
'Removal of the plague' viii 8, 31 x 17 cp ix 33.		
Marks of time 'to-morrow' viii 10, 23, 29 ix 5 f x 4.		
Unheard of character of the infliction ix 18, 24b x 6b, 14 xi 6.		
Pharaoh's heart 'stubborn' (Qal & Hiph) vii 14 viii 15, 32 ix 7, 34.	Pharaoh's heart 'strong' (Qal & Hiph) ix 35 x 20, 27.	Pharaoh's heart 'strong' (Qal & Hiph) vii 13, 22 viii 19 (ix 12 Pi). And he hearkened not as the LORD had spoken vii 10, 13, 22 viii 15, 19 ix 12.

Examination shows how purely factitious this list is. We have already seen that in E, act is made to follow act without recorded speech. Hence every phrase that is natural in dia-

logue must be assigned to J or P. The view taken by Mr. Carpenter of the relations of Moses and Aaron further enables him to assign to P all phrases in which Aaron occurs. And so on. "Land of Egypt," which is here quoted as characteristic of P, is a phrase which elsewhere J and E are permitted to use; e.g., ix. 23b and 24b (both J), 25a (E), etc. There is nothing in this style of argument that would detain a man of common sense and ordinary judgment for five minutes. At one moment Mr. Carpenter alleges that certain verses must belong to P because the phrase "land of Egypt" occurs, and then in the same chapter he allows other verses to go to other sources in spite of the fact that the very same phrase is found in them. If higher critics regard this sort of thing as convincing, we shall be pleased to let them have a monopoly of it. But we have thought it right to say a few words about this alleged "literary method," lest it should be thought that it is in any way more substantial than the rest of the critical case. Before passing away from it we should like to give a sample of what the critics are prepared to believe on the strength of such evidence. The following is the assignment of Exodus xiii. 3-16 in the Oxford Hexateuch:—

EXODUS XIII.

3. J:—And Moses said unto the people,
Harmonizing addition by RJe [i.e. the redactor of J and E]:—Remember this day in which ye came out from Egypt, out of the house of bondage; for by strength of hand the LORD brought you from this place: there shall no leavened bread be eaten.
4. J:—This day ye go forth in the month Abib.
5. *Supplement by a writer of the J School (J*)*:—And it shall be when the LORD shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanite, and the Hittite, and the Amorite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite, which he sware unto thy fathers to give thee, a land flowing with milk and honey, that thou shalt keep this service in this month.
6. J:—Seven days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, and in the seventh day shall be a feast to the LORD.

7. J^s [See 5 supra]:—Unleavened bread shall be eaten throughout the seven days; and there shall no leavened bread be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee, in all thy borders.

8. And thou shalt tell thy son in that day, saying, it is because of that which the LORD did for me when I came forth out of Egypt.

9. *A priestly redactor* (Rp):—And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the law of the LORD may be in thy mouth:

RJe [see supra 3]:—For with a strong hand hath the LORD brought thee out of Egypt.

10-13. J.

14-16. RJe.

And this is regarded as scholarship!

ARTICLE VII.

THE UNITAS FRATRUM.

BY PROFESSOR LOUIS F. MISKOVSKY, OBERLIN, OHIO.

No other Christian nation has had the religious experience of Bohemia. During her fifteen centuries on the stage of history she has changed her religion five times. Her first venture was the abandonment of Slavic paganism for Greek Christianity in 863. In the course of the tenth century she embraced Romanism, from which, over a century before Luther, she revolted during the Hussite reformation. For two centuries subsequent she remained the first of the Protestant nations, only to succumb to the Catholic counter-reformation during the Thirty Years' War, since which time Bohemia has again been almost exclusively Roman Catholic. A nation with such varied experience will have something of value to teach the religious world. Bohemia's pregnant history and tragic end entitle her to speak an authoritative word of warning and encouragement to her more favored sisters in the galaxy of Protestant nations. Moreover, it is a mistake to think that interest in Bohemia is confined to her religious history, and ceases with her decline after the Thirty Years' War. The nineteenth century witnessed her national resurrection, an event unparalleled in the annals of the race, and calling forth the wonder and admiration of no less a mind than Goethe's. Ignorance alone is responsible for the neglect of this rich historic lore on the part of English writers. Wherefore it is our purpose to shed a ray of light on this neglected subject by

giving a sketch of the best achievement of Bohemia in the religious field, the organization known as the *Unitas Fratrum*.

The rise, development, and decline of this church¹ present a unique phenomenon in history. It is generally conceded by Protestant writers that since the days of the Apostles no other church has so fully realized in practical life the ethical teachings of Christ, and that none other has shown a more earnest missionary spirit. Its type of piety, manifesting both a wholesome seriousness and a sane realism, its quiet but effective aggressiveness, its unflinching heroism during a century and a half of ceaseless persecution, its persistence and revival after apparent extermination, are facts which impress even the cursory student of its history. What were the causes that contributed to determine the unique character and career of the *Unitas Fratrum* among the Protestant churches? The answer lies partly in the circumstances that gave it birth, and partly in the peculiar temper and organization of this church.

As to the first, it is necessary to remove the common misconception that the *Unitas Fratrum* had its origin in the Taborite, or radical party of the Hussite church. Though the Brethren, especially in their later development, had doctrinally much in common with the Taborites, yet they differed from them completely in their spirit and methods. The Taborites were fighters, bent upon defending the freedom of the gospel with the sword: the Brethren were men of peace, aiming to disseminate the Truth by spiritual means only. The origin of the Brethren must rather be

¹ The *Unitas Fratrum* has also been known as the Church of the Bohemian Brethren, or the Moravian Church. The distinction between Bohemia and Moravia is purely geographical. Both countries form integral parts of the Bohemian crown, and are racially and linguistically one. The classic translation of the Bohemian Bible (Bible Kralická) was printed in Moravia.

sought in the numerous small circles of earnest Christians, that, after the Hussite wars, were found grouped about Utraquist, or Calyxtine, priests, whose exceptional piety and preaching talents attracted the more spiritually-minded souls of their times. For the original Hussite movement had failed of its purpose—namely, the spiritual reformation of the religious life. Realizing this, many Utraquists began grouping themselves about their more faithful pastors who had not been swept along with the tide of reaction following the protracted and exhausting wars, and nurtured by the compromise with the Roman Church. Conspicuous among these was John Rokycana, the Utraquist archbishop, who, whatever his motives, kept up the fight against Roman abuse and corruption, preserving thus in his hearers aspirations after a holy life. He emphasized the need of a return to the Scriptures as the only source of moral reform. In this regard he declared the church helpless because of the corruption of the clergy, which, he declared, was in turn the prolific source of the corruption of the laity. Rokycana's scathing denunciations of the church so wrought up the consciences of his hearers that in alarm for their souls' safety they at length besought him to abandon the church to its fate, and, placing himself at their head, to form a new society whose sole object was to be the seeking of personal salvation. In his embarrassment the archbishop counseled his followers to join the disciples of Peter Chelcicky, a small but influential band of radicals who regarded a holy life of infinitely more value than outward ceremonies or even the sacraments, and who had therefore repudiated every form of priesthood. The writings of Peter Chelcicky thus became the organizing principle of the *Unitas Fratrum*.¹ This

¹ Annenkov has recently issued a Russian translation of Chelcicky's most important theological work, *The Net of Faith*, from which Tolstol has drawn much of his doctrine of non-resistance to evil.

bold theologian stood above all parties, criticizing freely both Hussite and Romanist, and rejecting everything that in his judgment was inconsistent in their doctrines with the will of God as revealed in the Scriptures, especially in those of the New Testament. The Taborites he upbraided for their use of the sword in defense of Christian truth. Chelcicky denounced all war as unchristian, dubbing the Taborites murderers. Even Hus and his forerunners in reform, Janov, Milic, Waldhauser, he accused of being drunk with the wine of the great harlot, the Papal Church, and poisoned with the doctrines of the purgatory, false sacraments, and a host of other abuses. Chelcicky rejected transubstantiation, affirming merely the spiritual presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. In case of the moral unfitness of the priest, a layman may administer the sacrament. The Christian community, or the local church, has oversight over the life of its members, and to it belongs the right of electing its spiritual teachers. Good works are necessary to salvation, but must be performed freely, out of love and gratitude to God, and can impose upon him no obligation for our salvation.

Such was the doctrinal basis recommended to Rokycana's admirers for their guidance to spiritual salvation. Among the first to acquaint himself with the writings of Chelcicky was a poor young nobleman, afterwards known as Brother Gregory, who became the true founder and organizer of the *Unitas Fratrum*. At his suggestion the vacillating Rokycana obtained leave from King George Podiebrad for all who so desired to settle upon the latter's estate of Litice in eastern Bohemia. Thither, about the year 1450, Brother Gregory led his colony, consisting of the hearers of Rokycana, and settled with them in the village of Kunwald. They soon were joined by Michael, an Utraquist priest of the neighboring village of

Zamberk, and later by a number of other Hussite brotherhoods. Prominent among the latter were the Chelcic brethren, and the Moravian brethren, followers of one Stephen of Kremšier. A second community was organized by another disciple of Rokycana, the Utraquist priest Martin, who settled with his colonists in the village of Krcin. The two pastors, Michael and Martin, were the religious teachers of the colonists, but Brother Gregory remained the true leader and apostle of the new movement. This remarkable man traversed Bohemia from end to end, gaining new adherents, organizing new congregations, and laying thus the foundations for a rapid development of the new church. Rokycana had emphasized the indispensableness of a moral transformation to a genuine Christian life, and had insisted on maintaining strict discipline within the church. A pure life was therefore the first prerequisite to membership in the new body. Doctrinal questions and differences naturally fell into the background. Hence from the very start the Brethren were saved from succumbing to the endemic disease of the Bohemian people of the fifteenth century, namely, religious disputations. They did not feel the need of formulating a definite confession of faith, and so did not allow themselves to be entangled in the meshes of unprofitable theological speculations. And thus it happened that the Bohemian Brethren had a thorough organization, and maintained the strictest moral discipline in their church, long before they formulated their doctrinal beliefs. This avoidance of doctrinal disputes, and emphasis upon pure life and sincere faith as against symbol and ceremony, was a characteristic trait of all those small brotherhoods out of whose fusion arose the *Unitas Fratrum*. They had left their communions because they were weary of the old disputes and desired fellowship with spirits akin to their own, for whom religion

meant the realization of a holy life. Repudiating all ascetic and monastic ideals, they strove to attain right relations in the natural walks and occupations of men. The names "brethren," "brotherhood," had for them only a mystical significance, each brother being quite independent in the conduct of his domestic or private life.

The final separation of the Bohemian Brethren from the Utraquist or old Hussite church occurred in 1467, when they instituted their own clergy. Three pastors were elected by a representative assembly, and received ordination at the hands of a Waldensian priest. To avoid giving offense before the world, and to remove all occasion of stumbling on the part of the weaker members who might consider such ordination insufficient, episcopal ordination was sought the same year at the hands of the Waldensian bishop Stephen, residing in Moravia. Stephen ordained Michael, the pastor of Zamberk, and the latter passed the episcopal unction on one of the newly elected ministers, Matthew of Kunwald.

The ordaining of a separate and independent clergy raised the ire of Rokycana. Up to this moment he had continued friendly to the Brethren, and they had been unceasing in their efforts to win him for their head. But in Rokycana the half-hearted character of Utraquism had found a fitting embodiment. Always hoping to receive papal confirmation in the archiepiscopal office, he thundered at Roman heresy and abuse while his chances remained slim, but was ever ready to compromise with the pope when the latter showed signs of favoring his suit. Moreover, he was in the employ of the established (or state) church of Bohemia, and the constitution of the newly organized *Unitas Fratrum* called for an entire separation between church and state. When, before taking the final step, the Brethren requested him to join them and

become their leader, he replied, "You are too bold; the matter is full of danger, and it would be a tough leap" (*na tvrdo by bylo skociti*). To which they promptly retorted, "Rokycana, thou art a worldling, and with the world thou wilt perish." Ominous words and full of evil portent for Rokycana. The papal see never confirmed him in his office, and the archbishop elect of the Utraquist church died heart-broken at his unrealized ambitions.

Meantime the rupture had become complete, and from this time the ancient *Unitas Fratrum*, outlawed during its entire existence save the brief dozen years just before the Thirty Years' War, was to pass through the fires of persecution. Instigated by Rokycana, the Utraquist king George Podiebrad initiated against the Brethren the long series of repressive mandates whose rigorous execution made of them a truly martyr church. During the subsequent one hundred years no less than thirteen royal mandates were issued against the *Unitas Fratrum*, one of which (that of 1508) found its way into the national constitution. It may be said with truth that the Brethren never had respite from secular and ecclesiastical persecution. Yet in spite of this fact their numbers steadily increased, and their churches so multiplied, that at the beginning of the sixteenth century they had about four hundred congregations; and when, in 1609, the brief day of liberty finally dawned, they bade fair to gain eventually the whole nation on their side. More remarkable still, when the catastrophe of the Thirty Years' War had done its worst, and all seemed forever lost, it was from the smoldering ashes of the *Unitas Fratrum* that a hundred years later, under Zinzendorf's leadership, there arose, phoenix-like, the renewed *Unitas Fratrum*, or the modern Moravian Church. And most remarkable of all, after six generations of unparalleled persecution, when in 1781 the

liberal Emperor Joseph II. issued his Edict of Toleration, it was the lineal descendants of the *Unitas Fratrum* who alone preserved a knowledge of the former things, and showed a longing for a return to the pure faith of their fathers. Ultramorphism had succumbed completely, while the *Unitas Fratrum* had preserved a seed from which have sprung the modern Reformed and Lutheran churches of Bohemia and Moravia.

This brief historical sketch has led up to the main question, What is the secret of the remarkable vitality and power of this unique church? Apart from the fact that the *Unitas Fratrum* was built upon purely evangelical doctrines, being in reality a Reformed church before the Reformation, the present writer does not hesitate to ascribe its remarkable success in producing an exalted type of Christian character, and developing a vitality that should survive the most appalling disasters, to its thorough organization and its maintenance of the strictest moral discipline of all its adherents. Other churches have had as pure doctrines, nay, have produced profounder theologies and more elaborate confessions, but we venture to say that not one of our modern Protestant churches would have come out of the fiery trials that befel the *Unitas Fratrum* with the same honorable record, yea more, that not one of them would have survived the terrible ordeal. It is with no small interest, therefore, that one turns to the study of the ecclesiastical polity of the *Unitas Fratrum*, or the Church of the Bohemian Brethren.¹

¹ The sources for the study of the *Unitas Fratrum* are: (1) the *Decreta Unitatis Fratrum* (in Bohemian), covering the period from 1488 to 1636, edited by Antonín Gindely, Prague, 1865; (2) The *Ratio Disciplinæ Unitatis Fratrum*, adopted by the Synod of Zeravice, Moravia, in 1611, and first published in Poland, 1632, in the Bohemian language. A Latin edition, issued in Amsterdam, Holland, followed in 1660, and a German one in 1738, bearing the striking title: *Die apostolische Ordnung und Kirchen-Zucht, wie dieselbe bei*

In the first place, the Brethren were careful to distinguish from the start between things essential and those not essential to salvation, and to include nothing in their creed and polity that should in any way obscure or disturb the proper relations of the two. The original founders of the *Unitas Fratrum*,—to use their quaint phraseology,—“finding everything in the Christian religion obscured and perverted, so that people did not stop to consider what things were foremost and what things hindmost therein, and that the people for the most part passed by the essentials, and superstitiously based their hope of salvation mostly on non-essentials and empty ceremonies, began carefully to distinguish between the different elements that make up the Christian religion.” Hence they drew a sharp line between (1) things essential, (2) things helpful, and (3) things external in Christianity. Under the head of essentials they included those things which make up the substance of Christianity, and from which salvation flows; to wit, the grace of God the Father, the merit of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, on the divine side, and faith, love, and hope on the human. By things helpful they understood those things which God himself has ordained as means of securing the things essential; namely, the word of God, the power of the keys, and the sacraments. The word reveals, the keys adjudge, the sacraments seal unto us, the essential things of God. Finally, the things external, or merely incidental, in the Christian religion, the Brethren defined as the ordinances and ceremonies pertaining to things helpful in denen Gemeinden der Vereinigten Brüder in Böhmen, im Segen und zur allgemeinen seligen Erbauung und Wachsthum in dem Guten, beobachtet und geübet wurden. (3) The eighth chapter of the History of the Bohemian Brethren, by the Polish nobleman and reformer John Lasicki (Johannes a Lasco), published in Amsterdam, 1649, and entitled *Imago Unitatis Fratrum*.

the Christian religion and determining what outward acts are to be performed, and by whom, and where, in order that the essential truths of Christianity might not be obscured, but might rather be made the more potent in their operation.

The first two classes of truths the Brethren later freely acknowledged to hold in common with other Evangelical communions. It is in the last category of things incidental in the Christian religion that they avowedly differed from the churches of the Reformation. But to them they clung tenaciously, and that from principle, having (to quote) "diligently ascertained from the Holy Scriptures, and from the example of the primitive Christian churches, what things are conducive to the enlightenment and edification of the human conscience." But they sensibly add, "We do not cling to these things in such wise as to be adverse to change in case something more edifying were discovered, nor, on the other hand, do we consider it proper to change anything except for the gravest of reasons." It thus appears that the Brethren were conscious of the source of their strength, and guarded it with zealous care.

In putting their principles into practice, the Brethren very properly began with a gradation of their membership into four classes: that of beginners, those growing in grace, the perfect, and the fallen. Among the beginners were included those receiving instruction in the rudiments of the Christian religion, such as children, or adults who had been brought in the Roman Catholic faith, or those whose religious training had been in any wise neglected. These were intrusted to the special care of the pastors. The second class included those who had already attained a practical knowledge of the first principles of the Christian religion, and were under the full care of the pastors. Such were admitted to full membership

in the church, and enjoyed all its privileges. The perfect were those who had attained to so full a knowledge of the things of God, and were so rooted and grounded in Christian faith, love, and hope, that they were capable of enlightening others in them, and could be intrusted with oversight over the weaker members. From this class the lay officers of the local churches were elected. These included the judges, the almoners, the custodians, and the sister elders. Their duties were carefully defined and strictly performed. Space does not permit their detailed enumeration; their names indicate their nature and scope. But to give an idea of the thoroughness and comprehensiveness of the ecclesiastical fabric of the *Unitas Fratrum*, and of the seriousness and purity of spirit which characterized it, we shall indicate some of the duties of the lay elders, or judges of the congregation, as they were also called. These were elected by the entire congregation and were publicly confirmed in their office by the bishop or ordaining elder through the giving of the hand in token of fellowship and of obedience to their superiors. Their number depended upon the size of the local church, two or four being the usual thing. Their first duties concerned themselves and their own households, which they were bound so to manage as to be an example of piety and virtue unto others. Next came their relations to the pastor of the church. Though serving as his assistants, they had oversight over him, visiting him in his home, and ascertaining whether everything there were properly conducted, and reporting any needs or deficiencies to the church. In like manner they had liberty to visit the home of any member of the church, to note the conduct of husband and wife, children and domestics, correcting offenses, and enjoining family worship both morning and evening. They had power to admonish and reprove the worldly, to report the im-

penitent or rebellious to the pastor; in short, they were expected to prevent all possible offenses and scandals in the church. If the head of a household lay sick, it was their duty to visit and comfort him, and in case of emergency to secure provision for the proper support of his widow and orphaned children. To prevent confusion and possible litigation, they were to assist in the settlement of all debts, preferably before the man's demise. In case any orphans or wards were left, the judges had oversight over their interests, that no injustice might be done them. It was also their duty to request the pastor to administer the Lord's Supper to the sick, the judges taking part in the sacrament, and to impart to him the consolations of the dying. At wedding festivities the judges by their presence were expected to set an example of modest and quiet rejoicing, and to prevent all excess and drunkenness. And finally it was their duty to adjust all differences between the brethren, and in case their advice were not accepted, to pray the litigants so to conduct their case in the secular courts that no harm might come to the church through public scandal.

A word about the last division of the laity may not be amiss. These were the fallen, or penitents, and embraced those who were either under discipline or had been expelled from the fellowship of the church. They were by no means neglected or forgotten, but were faithfully labored with, if by any means they might be induced to return to God; and become once more partakers of Christ. All such were not allowed to sit with the rest of the congregation, but had a special place assigned them, not only that they might be made to realize their guilt, and, being brought to penitence, might henceforth be the more zealous in overcoming evil, but also that the just distinction between the good and the bad might be apparent to all.

The order of the clergy among the Brethren was even more

thoroughly organized and disciplined than that of the laity. We shall probably get the best idea of it by following the evolution of a pastor in the *Unitas Fratrum*. While this church had numerous schools of all grades, from the primary school to the college, it had no theological seminaries, but intrusted the training and education of its pastors to the rank and file of its ministry. The different steps in the process corresponded to the four orders of the clergy, or servants of the church; namely, that of acolytes, of deacons, of pastors, and of elders, or bishops. The training of the candidates began early, in fact in childhood. Every settled pastor was required to associate with himself in his household a number of boys with view to training them for the ministry. Extreme care was exercised to choose these from the best Christian families, birth in wedlock being an indispensable consideration. Piety, humility, dignity, a serious, courteous, and obedient spirit were prized above mere brightness of intellect. Hence the early training of these acolytes was rather in piety and good morals than along literary lines. They were expected to excel other youths in piety, in soberness, in obedience to their superiors, and to cultivate the true spirit of disciples and servants. The ringing of the bell for public worship, the opening and the shutting of the church doors, the care of the lights, were some of their menial tasks. The beginnings of theological study consisted in memorizing the larger catechism, the gospels, the shorter epistles, the psalms, and numerous church hymns. At family worship they took part in reading from the Scriptures, occasionally making short exhortations from them, and in offering prayer. In the parish school they assisted in the instruction of the younger children in the catechism. It was their privilege to accompany their pastor on his official tours, not merely in the capacity of servants, but rather that they

might get accustomed to the proper performance of pastoral duties and be witnesses to the good demeanor of their spiritual guide. In the absence of the pastor they were permitted to conduct the minor meetings.

When an acolyte advanced sufficiently in age and literary attainments, he was promoted into the order of deacons. He now gave himself wholly to the study of theology, instructed the school children in the catechism, gave himself to the preparation and delivery of sermons, baptized children, and assisted in the administration of the Lord's Supper when so requested by the pastor. From the order of deacons the regular ministry was chosen. The entrance into any of the orders of the clergy was through the public setting apart for the same. This consisted of appropriate exercises, the chief part of which was the reading of his duties to the candidate, his public promise faithfully to perform the same, his promise of obedience to his superiors, and his presentation to the congregation.

The final process of ordination to the pastoral office was a severe ordeal. The consecration was performed only at the annual, or general, synods, and according to the most rigid rules and forms. The first step was for the pastor to notify his congregation in writing of his intention to present his candidates for ordination at the coming synod. Next the judges, or lay elders, forwarded a written request to the synod, praying that body to take the case of their deacons under consideration, adding their testimony to the moral character and intellectual ability of the candidates, but intrusting the final decision entirely into the hands of the synod. The candidates were also required to furnish a written statement touching the Christian character and general good repute of their parents, including references to their own birth in wedlock. At the

synod they underwent a threefold examination—one before the whole assembly, another before a committee of assistant elders, and a third before a single elder, or bishop, in private.

Before the first examination, the names of the candidates were publicly presented to all the pastors and lay delegates in synod assembled. These then inquired closely into the character and qualifications of each candidate separately, submitting the result of their examination to the elders, or bishops, in writing. If the report was favorable, the candidates were next examined before the assistant elders. Three or four of these would meet about the same number of the deacons, and examine them concerning their knowledge of the Scriptures, their doctrinal views, their personal faith and Christian experience. The candidates were also questioned concerning their motives in seeking ministerial ordination, particularly whether it was their desire to serve Christ and his church, and to seek the salvation of men, or whether they were prompted by any selfish considerations. Finally their age and wisdom were considered, that their youth and inexperience might not become a snare unto them.

If the second examination was sustained, each candidate met one of the bishops privately for the final test. We shall let the Brethren themselves describe the nature of this pithy interview.

“The bishop setting before the candidate the exalted nature, the hardships and dangers, of the pastoral calling, begins to probe the conscience of the aspirant for the office. Are his motives pure, or is his conscience defiled with anything ignoble that would unfit him for so glorious and so heavenly a calling, and cause him but grief and compunction, and possibly bring the wrath and vengeance of God upon him? Has he any bad habits? Is there anything boorish or improper in his manners, and is he willing to correct such fault? Does he desire to serve Christ from pure love, or is he merely seeking a living? Is he willing to share with his hearers not only the gospel, but also his very heart and life?”

These and similar questions were put to the candidate in so earnest and solemn a manner, that, we are told, some, feeling smitten in conscience or becoming distrustful of themselves, begged to be released from assuming the duties of so arduous an office, realizing they had more need of seeking their own salvation with fear and trembling than that they should be intrusted with care for the souls of others. And those that did eventually assume the pastoral office did so only with great anguish of soul, and in humble reliance on God's gracious promises.

The ordination of deacons was in public, and was preceded by a day of fasting and prayer for the candidates and for the needs of the church. The examining committee made their report to the synod, and presented the petition of the church for the ordination of the deacons to the ministry. Then followed the reading of the duties of pastors, which the candidates solemnly acknowledged and accepted, promising to continue in the faithful performance of the same as long as their natural life did last. Upon which the act of ordination was performed through the laying on of the hands of all the bishops present, and prayer, with benediction. The service was concluded by an exhortation to steadfastness and faithfulness on the part of the newly ordained ministers, and the giving of the hand to the bishops in token of obedience, and to the other pastors in token of fellowship, the ordained in turn receiving promises of obedience from the deacons and acolytes, and from the whole congregation. The celebration of the Lord's Supper, chiefly for the strengthening of the new ministers in their calling, fitly crowned the solemn proceedings.

The ceremony of ordination was followed by the pastoral visit. The bishop within whose superintendence the new ministers belonged took them on his official tour for the purpose

of presenting them to the churches, and of promoting mutual acquaintance. In every church visited, the bishop made public announcement of the regular ordination of his protégés. that their standing in the church might become known to all. Short addresses were made by the young ministers to the people, and public prayer was offered for God's blessing on their ministry. In conclusion the bishop conducted the new preachers to the pulpit, and, placing in their hands the symbolical books of the church, exhorted them to the faithful performance of their ministerial duties.

The act of ordination, however, merely introduced the young minister to the pastoral calling. Before being intrusted with a church, he was obliged to serve a term of apprenticeship, from one to four years long, acting as assistant to a regular pastor or to a bishop. This enabled him to get practical knowledge of the work of the ministry, and by experience to become thoroughly fitted for wise and efficient service. It was also in this period that, with the advice and consent of his superiors, the young minister entered upon matrimony. The final settlement of a pastor in his parish was done by the appointment of the bishop, whose duty it was to supply the churches with suitable ministers. This service was conscientiously performed. The churches rarely received a pastor unfit for the place assigned him, and it was expected that the settlement be cheerfully accepted, and be considered lifelong. The ministers in the *Unitas Fratrum* stood upon terms of absolute equality, the rank of a pastor in the regard of the church being determined by priority of ordination. The order of elders, or bishops, did not imply any higher rank or superior sanctity, but represented special service only. Their one distinctive prerogative was their ordaining power. Ordination, as already mentioned, was performed only at the annual syn-

ods. This peculiar practice was intended to guard the purity and competence of the ministry. There were in the later years of the *Unitas Fratrum* six ordaining bishops, two residing in Bohemia, two in Moravia, and two in Poland.

Space does not permit describing the pastoral visits of the bishops, or the ceremonial customs and regulations of the Bohemian Brethren, or their manner of preaching the word of God, which was done at five public services every Sunday. A few words, however, may profitably be devoted to describing the method of admitting to membership in the Unity. One might be tempted to think that, inasmuch as the *Unitas Fratrum* stood without the pale of the law practically during its whole existence, the question of admitting new members would receive but scant attention, as no one not thoroughly in earnest would seek fellowship in an outlawed church. But, on the contrary, the Brethren were extremely careful to bar out all unworthy members, and to admit to fellowship and to assume responsibility only for such of whose probity and Christian knowledge and experience they were certain. This has been the case with all churches whose life was cast upon troublous times. And the *Unitas Fratrum* is the only church since the days of Constantine whose relation to the state was analogous to that of the early Christian church. This fact no doubt accounts largely for the measure of success with which it reproduced the purity and fervor of the early Christian church.

Adults seeking admission from other evangelical bodies, which in later years meant the Lutherans chiefly, were generally received upon promise of obedience to the pastors, and of willingness to be subject to all the rules regulating the life and conduct of members of the Unity. They were exhorted to renew their vows to lead a holy life, and upon receiving the

right hand of fellowship were admitted to all the privileges of the church. Those coming from the Papal Church were first admonished to consider well the step they were about to take. If the applicant professed to have carefully considered the question, he was asked to give his reasons for wishing to leave his church and seeking to join another. In case these were found satisfactory, he was admitted to the class of beginners, or catechumens, where he might become better acquainted with the life and doctrines of the church, and the church in turn could test his sincerity and piety. Before full admission was granted, the applicant was again questioned concerning his motives in seeking admission to the Unity. Was it because he found the truth of God, good government, and wholesome discipline among the Brethren? Has he confidence in their teachings, their discipline, their pastoral oversight and guidance? If so, is he willing to submit himself to the teachings of God's truth, and to the government of the Unity, to keep the covenant of God, to flee the world and its lusts, and to lead a holy life in accordance with God's will? Does he give the pastor and the lay officers of the local church full right to teach, warn, admonish, reprove, and in case of need to discipline him? And, finally, is he willing and ready to suffer reproach and persecution for the name of Christ? If all was found satisfactory, this private examination before the pastor and the church officers was followed by public reception to membership at the next communion. The candidate was again exhorted to steadfastness in following the truth of God to the end, and the pastor, giving the new member the right hand of fellowship in token of obedience to Christ, announced his reception into the church, and admission to all its privileges. The reception of children was conducted in a similar manner. They were never admitted under twelve years of age, and in

addition to other formalities the rite of laying on of hands was publicly performed over them.

What now are the lessons for our own time to be gained from this brief survey of the organization and practices of the *Unitas Fratrum*? Enough has been said to show the importance attached to order and discipline by the Bohemian Brethren, and the thoroughness and minuteness of the regulations and restrictions that governed both their clergy and laity. There was a studied balancing of the power and duties of both, which, while maintaining the purity and spirituality of the church, greatly facilitated its government and contributed in no small measure to its spread and growth. And the most striking thing is the beautiful spirit of devotion of the Brethren to their institutions. To us their discipline may seem a bit rigid and exacting, but to them it was an easy yoke, which they gladly bore for Christ's own sake. To quote their own testimony:

"We have all been subject to these salutary regulations from the beginning of our organization, and that voluntarily, and without any coercion. Our discipline is maintained cheerfully, there being nothing hard or compulsory or slavish in our reasonable and well-ordered polity, whose animating principle is strict discipline ministering unto our salvation. On the contrary it is to us Christ's easy yoke and light burden which bring peace and refreshment to souls devoted to God."

It is our conviction that, next to the possession of the pure truth of the gospel and simple, childlike faith therein, the one thing which gave the *Unitas Fratrum* its strength and vitality was its splendid discipline and organization. One cannot attribute the remarkable success of this church as a regenerating and missionary force in the world to its theological achievements. The Reformed and Lutheran churches produced profounder theologies, only to become in time mere ballast,

retarding their spiritual progress. And doctrinally the modern Moravian church, the lineal descendant and successor of the ancient *Unitas Fratrum*, harbors both these theologies. On the Continent the Moravian church adheres to the Lutheran symbols, in England and in America to the Reformed. And yet the same spirit pervades the entire Moravian church. This indeed is the distinctive heritage which the *Unitas Fratrum* has bequeathed it. And this likewise explains its wonderful missionary activity. It is a historical fact that there is no region of the earth into which the Protestant missionaries of the nineteenth century penetrated where they did not find the Moravians before them. Hence, in our judgment, the great lesson the *Unitas Fratrum* has to teach our age is the value and need of well-regulated ecclesiastical government—better order and stricter discipline in our churches. Of doctrines and machinery we have plenty: the one thing needful is life nurtured by wholesome discipline in the spirit of the gospel of Christ.

ARTICLE VIII.

HOMER AND THE HIGHER CRITICS.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM WALLACE EVERTS, BOSTON, MASS.

THE higher criticism of Homer and the "Iliad" forms a startling and perfect parallel to the course of the higher criticism of Moses and the Pentateuch. The reader is asked to think of Wellhausen whenever Wolf is mentioned, and to think of fragments and documents when lays are referred to. With this parallel in mind this article should have a double interest.

The unity of the Iliad, the consecutiveness of the story, its climaxes, its ancient dialect, its stately meter, and its grand style, all alike point to one master mind as its creator. Plato called Homer the author of the Iliad and said that he was the educator of Greece; Aristotle spoke of him as the only poet who knew his business. Herodotus told when he lived, and Thucydides quoted him as the chief authority on early Greek History. The grammarians of Alexandria made painstaking commentaries on his language. The dramatists, the artists, the Greek race, drew their inspiration from his great epics. The common belief that Homer wrote the Iliad is hardly called in question until the year 1795, when Frederick A. Wolf, a professor at Halle, opposed the almost unanimous verdict of the past, and set up his opinion that Homer could not have written the Iliad.

There were three currents of European thought at that time that helped to carry forward his paradox. One was the

new interest in classical studies, awakened partly by the discovery of ancient frescos and statuary at Pompeii, and advanced especially by Winckelmann in art, and by Lessing in letters. When Lessing's "Laocoön" appeared in 1766, the young poet Herder read it through three times in succession. Schiller and Goethe took themes for their poems from the classics. It was a second renaissance in Germany. With this revived interest in classical studies, Wolf's elaborate Prolegomena to the Iliad, at whatever conclusions the writer may have arrived, was sure of an enthusiastic welcome.

Another strong current of thought at that time appeared in the critical philosophy of Kant and the skeptical theology of Semler. Kant denied the validity of the commonly accepted proofs of the existence of God and of immortality. His keen criticism examined the foundations of all institutions. It became the fashion to call in question traditions of every kind. The *consensus gentium* was disregarded, nothing was so sacred as to escape investigation. An effort was made to reconstruct history. Schleiermacher concluded, when a youth, that all ancient authors were supposititious. Hume declared that the first page of Thucydides was the beginning of history. De Beaufort called in question the trustworthiness of the first five centuries of Roman History. It was in the year 1753 that Astruc, the French physician, published his analysis of the Hebrew text of Genesis, and claimed that he had retraced its constituent parts to their original authors. The very name "Higher Criticism" originated in the year 1780 with the rationalist Eichhorn. One of the few men who influenced Wolf was Semler, the father of rationalism; the other was the skeptic Lessing, whose picture was the sole ornament of his lecture-room. To an age of doubt, Wolf's doubt as to the existence of Homer was not unacceptable.

A third current of thought in the last half of the eighteenth century is known as romanticism. It is traceable to the English deists, with their reaction against the revelation of the Bible and their appeal to the revelation of nature. They were succeeded by Addison, who invented the term "Romantic," and by Thomson with his "Seasons" and Young with his "Night Thoughts," which started the Romantic school in Germany. This reaction was also against the classics in favor of Folk Lore. Just then, in 1750, the "Nibelungenlied" was rediscovered, and in 1766 the Norse "Edda" was published; then followed the "storm and stress" period, which magnified the love of nature. Its literature was Rousseau's "New Heloise," Schiller's "Robbers," and Goethe's "Goetz von Berlichingen." Brentano published folk songs, and Klopstock preferred these free products of the German muse to the conventional classics. The attention of linguists was now turned to the poetry of nature, as opposed to the poetry of art. There was a complete revolution of literary taste in England and Germany. Zoega and Vico apostrophized primitive man and the age when every one was a poet. The savage was idealized as a spontaneous and impromptu singer of beautiful songs. There was a craze for songs that sang themselves, that sprang out of the heart of a race without waiting for an age of culture or for a poetical genius to appear. It was the psychological moment for an impostor to come upon the stage and play upon a credulous age. He came. It was MacPherson with the lays of ancient Ossian. When they appeared in 1762, literary men, already favorably predisposed, received them without question as products of a primitive age, of men in a state of nature. They did not detect MacPherson's imitation of Thomson and Young. Even Klopstock, Herder, and young Goethe were bewitched by them.

The lays of Ossian, supposed to be genuine, led a dull Englishman named Wood to conclude that if Ossian composed in lays, Homer must have composed in lays also. This remarkable conclusion of Wood's was set forth in 1769 in a volume entitled "The Original Genius of Homer." This book appeared in a small edition for circulation among his friends, but a copy reached Hanover, the old home of King George, and there it was reviewed in the most flattering way by Heyne, a professor at Göttingen and at that time the chief classical authority in Germany. With such a commendation, the little book, when translated in 1773, produced a veritable furor among learned men. Wood called attention to Cicero's remark that the scattered books of the Iliad had been put together in order by Pisistratus. Pisistratus he compared to MacPherson, who had gathered and arranged the lays of Ossian. Wood supposed that the Greeks of the heroic age were in a primitive state. He says that Homer never refers to laws, treaties, annals, inscriptions, or letters, and he queried whether Homer could even write. He compared the Iliad, as the poetry of nature, with the lays of Ossian and the *'Nibelungenlied*. The great Heyne, whose whole life was devoted to the study of Greek, acquiesced in Wood's novel views, and declared that the Greeks of the Homeric Age were hardly out of the rough state of nature and were taking the first steps towards civilization. To understand the books of Homer, he said, you must read books of travel among savages. Tiedemann concluded that Homer could not write, and Merian added that if Homer could have written, Pisistratus, the redactor, would have had nothing to do.

With all the learned world wondering whether Homer could write, and encouraged by Astruc's successful discovery

of the original fragments out of which Genesis had been patched together, Wolf undertook to follow Astruc's example and Wood's suggestion, and discover the fragments out of which Pisistratus, as redactor, had patched the Iliad together. If Pisistratus put together the pieces that form the Iliad, as Cicero said he did, why cannot the poem be separated into the original pieces again? If, as Josephus said, the Iliad was originally committed to memory, not to writing, it must have consisted at first of short lays like Ossian's or it could not have been remembered. If, as Wood says, Homer could not write, then it follows that he could not have composed so long a piece as the Iliad. Taking up these hints from Cicero and Josephus, and adopting the conclusions of Astruc and Wood, Wolf published, in the year 1795, his famous "*Prolegomena to the Iliad.*"

Wolf was nothing if not critical. He was in a fight all his life. He fought his teachers from the start. He was angry with Heyne and Herder because they found nothing new in his *Prolegomena*. He separated from his wife in 1802, and when he removed to Berlin he was in constant strife with his colleagues and the government there. His fierce attack on Dindorf, for anticipating him in publishing an edition of Plato, called forth a printed censure from Niebuhr, Humboldt, Boeckh, Buttmann, and Schleiermacher. Goethe called upon him in 1816 and observed: "He contradicts everything one says, and denies everything that exists." Wolf had the wrath of Achilles, but it was never appeased. His unamiable disposition and uncontrollable temper fitted him not to weigh arguments or to appreciate beauty, but to act with arbitrariness and obstinacy. He lacked the judicial temper. He silenced the protest of his own better judgment in adopting his novel hypotheses.

“ When I think [he says] of the one color in these songs, or how the colors harmonize with the song, how the times fit the things, and the things the times, how the same lineaments of genius are present in the chief characters throughout, scarcely any one could be more angry with me than I am with myself. I am driven against my will by historical principles to give up my loved Homer.”

What were his historical principles to which he sacrificed everything? They were Cicero's vague remark that Pisistratus gathered the Homeric poems together, Josephus' intimation that the Iliad was committed to memory, and Wood's double assumption that Homer could not write and that primitive poetry was all, like Ossian's Reliques, composed in short lays. Wolf misunderstood Cicero, misrepresented Josephus, and accepted the conclusions of an amateur like Wood, and then claimed that he had overthrown the old view of the great age of Greek literature and proved that the name Homer should not be associated with a great work of art. He abandoned true historical principles which are based upon ancient and universal tradition for an hypothesis resting on a single, late, casual, and vague remark made by Cicero.

His Prolegomena is an attempt to establish his perverted interpretation of the saying of Cicero that Pisistratus made a collection of the Homeric poems. To his mind, Cicero meant to say that Pisistratus, not Homer, made the Iliad; that before the day of Pisistratus there was no Iliad, nothing but loose, disjointed poems which Pisistratus and his editors and his redactors patched together. In proof of his astonishing gloss of Cicero, he used two old arguments. First, he insisted that, as Homer could not write and the people could not read, it was impossible for him to compose, or for his disciples to remember and preserve, such a long poem as the Iliad. If Homer could have composed such a long epic, it

would have been like building a ship on land; there was no audience to appreciate the epic. The size and plan of the *Iliad* require a later, a writing, age for its production. No one could compose mentally, without the aid of writing, such a long poem. A man capable of composing such a long poem could not have lived in an age before writing was in use. Homer was not a poet, but a minstrel, one of many, whose songs Pisistratus combined in the *Iliad*. The *Iliad* was originally composed not to be read, but to be sung.

The other argument used by Wolf was derived from internal evidence. He thought he saw, in the text, seams where there had been breaks in the epic, cleavages that the editors under Pisistratus had but half concealed.

"The *Iliad* [he said] has the same tone of language, but on closer examination of its words and phrases, divergences appear."

For instance, Pylaemenes, who is slain in the fifth, reappears in the thirteenth book, following his son to burial; indeed, some of the heroes are killed several times. The polish of the *Iliad* is due to the care of the redactor, who, by omissions and additions, worked up the original lays into a great connected whole. The various readings found in the scholia of a Venetian codex of the *Iliad* published by Villoison were exploited for further proof of the multifarious origin of the epic. All this was said with singular moderation, and yet with great decision said in felicitous Latin phrases. The age was predisposed to adopt the theory that lays must precede epics, and it accepted as an accomplished fact the hypothesis so elaborately defended. If the book of two hundred and eighty pages had appeared in German with the Latin garb torn off, it would not have deceived the learned world as it did. Its specious, vague, and superficial arguments, its presentation of the definite results of sharp inves-

tigation, its universal erudition, flashing wit, and wonderfully bewitching style, all helped to carry conviction. He made the uncertain appear certain. His ideas seemed so original, so obvious and common-sense, that before the last page was reached, the reader was generally convinced.

Heyne wrote: "The ideas you present were suggested to me when I read Ossian," and Herder claimed that he had long known that the Iliad originated in rhapsodies, and that Homer is the name of a constellation of poets. Humboldt and Goethe read their Iliad through again to test Wolf's theory, and they declared that they were convinced of its truth. Philologists who understood neither poetry nor history, and philosophers who did not know Greek well enough to discover Wolf's mistakes, accepted his conclusions without hesitation. Fichte claimed that he had arrived at the same conclusions as those reached by Wolf, through his historical investigations, by the use of the *a priori* method. W. Müller, in his introduction to Homer in 1824, pronounced the Prolegomena as convincing as a mathematical demonstration.

"It contains truth drawn deeply from nature and the life of antiquity. These facts, so little known to the Greeks and Romans, can be questioned only by a presumptive idiot. Those who would reinstate Homer are not philologists, but misologists."

Schlegel, philosopher and art critic, objected to Wolf's philosophical taste, and knowledge of Greek poetry, but he nevertheless compared his book as a side piece to Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason."

"The Iliad is a work not conceived and executed [he said], but one that was born and grew naturally. It was the redactor who made the Iliad."

Niebuhr adopted Wolf's theory, and proceeded to reconstruct Roman history upon the basis of popular lays and bal-

lads. Wolf lived nearly thirty years after publishing his book, and yet no serious attempt had been made by a philologist to answer his argument. The argument was stated so powerfully that only powerful men could oppose it. He was Hellenic dictator for the nonce; and when opposition arose, Lachmann, famous for his edition of the Greek Testament, threw the whole weight of his enormous influence on Wolf's side, and with his pupil, Moritz Haupt, made the issue of the conflict uncertain fifty years longer.

Lachmann adopted Wolf's theory that epics are lays reduced to order, and applied it first to the *Nibelungenlied*. He restored that long epic into its original form of twenty lays, he exposed to view the fissures that the redactor had vainly sought to hide,—fissures whose existence no one had suspected till Lachmann called attention to them, defects such as a childish mind is delighted to have pointed out in a work that appears to be perfect. His keen eye discovered in the poem awkward junctures and apparent discrepancies, that revealed to him diversity of origin. So great was his authority and Haupt's, that as late as 1877 their theory was generally taught in German universities.

After his apparent success in dissecting the *Nibelungenlied*, Lachmann proceeded to analyze the *Iliad* in the same way, carrying out Wolf's suggestion in detail. He broke the *Iliad* up into eighteen lays. "It is not an individual poet that created the unities of the epic," he said, "but legends working unconsciously." He found the glory of the *Iliad* not in the whole epic with its symmetry and unity, but in the separate lays. The parts he accounted greater than the whole, for the lays were spoiled when they were squeezed into the mold of the epic. He laughed at those who talk, like women, of their dear Homer. In his work of disintegration, he drew sweeping con-

clusions from trivial objections, such as can be made against any great poet. He did not hesitate to say that the parts were ill-adjusted, that connections were senseless, that personages were inserted in the wrong place, that the description of arms, raiment, and feasts was useless, that there were frequent gaps, inequalities, yes contradictions. He felt compelled to exclude hundreds of lines, because of these apparent contradictions. No primitive poet could contradict himself as Homer does. For instance, one day the gods went to Ethiopia and the next they were at Troy. In one place mention is made of two gates in the Achæan wall, in another of only one. The ships of Aias are arranged first at the end of the line and then next to the Athenians.

This *tour de force* had its admirers, the crowd that counts more than it weighs, that worships a great name and wants to be considered in line with the advanced thought of the hour. The followers of Lachmann carried their master's method to further extremes, making breaks where they could not find joints, and subdividing his divisions, until by their complications they made his theory ridiculous. Koechly, one of these extremists, cut up Book II., as Lachmann himself admitted, in an impossible way.

To make the original ballads appear plainly, they were printed in different types. Lachmann said:

"I will publish these sections; that will be a sufficient answer to them. The method of the book seems to be strict, but it is really very arbitrary."

The anatomy of the epic differed from the one Lachmann had pointed out. The lays began and ended at different places. There was no end to invention, but there was no progress to the criticism of the Iliad in this way.

"Nothing is gained by analysis [as Professor Davis of Princeton,

speaking of Genesis, says] unless the documents discovered by it are inconsistent. The supreme question concerns the authenticity of these early narratives, and the debate is being made to rest more and more upon broader considerations than the analysis."

But Koechly maintained that Wolf's theory was the citadel and stronghold of Homeric studies, and he boasted that the European mind had recovered from the English superstition of the unity of the Iliad. When Schutze, in 1862, objected to Koechly's position, he admitted that the majority of scholars were against him.

The great Moritz Haupt insisted

"that the opinion of antiquity, that knew nothing of the origin of the Iliad, should not keep us from free and independent investigation,"

but he admitted that there were three vital questions which no one could answer.

"There would be no doubt left [he said] if it were possible to trace step by step how the idea of one author of the Iliad arose, how gradually the lay origin was forgotten, and when the original lays appeared."

Kirchoff, the authority on the Odyssey, printed, in 1859, an edition of that work in different types, to disclose the different original ballads out of which the epic had been composed. In 1865, Mark Pattison published an article in the *North British Review* in which he asserted that

"no scholar will again be able to embrace the unitarian hypothesis. Wolf's ideas are now the common property of the world, his main proposition has maintained itself unshaken and his views are continually gaining ground."

F. A. Paley, author of "Annotations on the Iliad," asserted that there was no Iliad before the days of Pisistratus, and that all earlier allusions to the Iliad are interpolations. Paul Cauer proclaimed his adherence to the school of Lachmann, and H. C. Benicke discovered an author for each lay. The anti-

quarian Schoemann declared that the Trojan war belonged to the domain, not of history, but of fable. H. Bonitz, an authority on Plato, expressed his satisfaction with the separation of the Iliad into different lays, because in that way all contradictions were made to disappear. Even Renan was swept off his feet by the tide of scholarship, but he "wondered at the genius of the compilers who had done their work so cleverly that the junctures hardly ever appear." Max Müller also was deluded, for he said that the battle of Troy was "a battle between the sun and the clouds." Our American professor, Henry Hedge, was caught in the current, and as late as 1886 he said, "The Iliad is not the work of art; Homer was not a poet, but a singer."

Such has been the apparent triumph of Wolf's higher criticism of Homer, but from the first his position was questioned. For a generation, no Greek scholar outside of Germany assented to the new opinion. Men like Humboldt, Goethe, and Boeckh, who had first adopted the new hypothesis, upon further reflection rejected it. Literary men, among them the leading poets of Germany, protested against it vehemently. Voss, the translator of the Iliad, was angry because Wolf did not produce in detail his promised proofs in defense of his position, and he charged him with playing on the surface and he denounced him for making Homer a gatherer and a patch-maker.

"No, the Iliad and Odyssey are branches of one tree [he said to Wolf]. You smile. Ask Klopstock and Goethe. I will not attack your citadel. I will go around it. Homer composed those two unties, or inner proofs prove nothing. It would be purely impossible for Homer, to say nothing of Pisistratus, to produce the Iliad out of ballads. If Homer could not write, he was all the greater. At first I took your book as a joke. It is a mere assumption of a dim impression without proof."

Voss argued thus till he made Wolf's head ache.

Schiller sustained Voss's position.

"You may count up the fathers of the *Iliad*, but it had only one mother, and that is nature. If Homer had not the testimony of a thousand years behind him, he could not stand in reputation before these critics. It is hard for them to maintain their rules in presence of his example, and his renown in presence of their rules. It is essentially barbarous to tear the *Iliad* to shreds, and to say that rhapsodists strung lays together to form the *Iliad*."

Goethe admitted to Schiller that he had returned to his original convictions.

"I am more than ever convinced [he said] of the unity and indivisibility of the *Iliad*, and there is no man living or ever will live who can change this conviction. I prefer to think of the *Iliad* as a whole, to feel it joyfully as a whole. There is too much subjective in this whole business. It is interesting to doubt, but it is not edifying. These gentlemen are laying waste the most fruitful garden of the earthly kingdom. They have taken away from us all veneration. It is pernicious to compare the *Nibelungenlied* with the *Iliad*. The *Iliad* is so round and complete, they may say what they will, that nothing can be added to it, or taken from it."

Walter Scott would not listen to Wolf's views, and De Quincey remarked that Wolf had "raised a ghost he could not lay." Mrs. Browning said:

"Wolf's an atheist,
And if the *Iliad* fell out, as he says,
By mere fortuitous concurrence of old songs,
We'll guess as much too for the universe."

Matthew Arnold made an elaborate defense of Homer.

"The insurmountable obstacle in the way of believing that the *Iliad* combines the work of several poets [he said] is this: that the work of great masters is unique. The nobleness of manner of the grand style characterizes Homer. The *Iliad* has fire, grandeur, and pathos. The grand style is found where a noble nature, poetically gifted, treats with simplicity or severity a serious subject. The high seriousness of absolute sincerity is the test of supreme merit in poetry. Nobody can separate the *Iliad* except with scissors. It is as much a unity as the *Æneid* or *Paradise Lost*. Could several poets

produce such literary conformity? Who were these wonderful anonymous writers?

"There is only one great anonymity in English Literature. Wolf's new broom was much admired, and swept clean, but the criticism of Homer is now seen to have been but a current episode, a passing breeze, a trick of the century. To suppose the later origin of the poems is to credit the later Greeks with a power of historical imagination, and with means of archæological research, such as have hardly been equaled in the history of the world. How could they throw themselves into a *description* of the past without allowing a single anachronism to escape them? The poem reached its present shape in the alembic of a great mind, by the genius of a great poet, or through fortuitous concourse, ages long, among a people bright, but not one of them a supreme genius in the days of Pisistratus. It is better to lay down the microscope and take up the field-glass and observe the grand plan and execution possible only to great poetical genius. As John Wilson said: some believe in twenty Homers. I believe in one. Nature is not so lavish of her great poets. What terrible learning which discovers so much. In the German mind as in the German language, there does seem to be something splay, something blunt-edged, unhandy, infelicitous, some positive want of straightforward sure perception. Great learning is inadequate to cope with any nice literary problems. An oversupply of unvitalized facts may prove disastrous to criticism. The critic of poetry should have fine tact, nicest moderation, most free, flexible, and elastic imagination."

Saint Beuve agrees with Matthew Arnold and asks:

"Can we believe that there was such an epoch when the Homeric genius without a Homer was in the air and rolled here and there like a divine tempest?"

Michael Breal, in a French review of 1903, said:

"An age that believed in Ossian attributed to popular inspiration the *Iliad*, with its theme treated progressively, with its invariable meter and its verses of irreproachable facture. Are we to suppose that the Greeks could not prepare manuscripts as well as the Egyptians? Oral propagation would never have preserved an Epic poem, for it preserves nothing and disfigures everything. The result of criticism is to cut off the most beautiful part of the poem under pretense of restoring the primitive form. The hexameter is fixed while popular meters are not responsive to law. No versifier could put old songs into one hexameter. The French Academy of Inscriptions could not do it. The meter is a sufficient reply to Lachmann. Such a masterpiece presupposes not only a rare poetical genius, but also

a long finished form, a poet and a tradition. The tradition gives the meter, the vocabulary, the grammatical forms, epithets and paragraphs. Homer represents not an infant, but a mature age. Folk songs are short dialogues, not narrations and descriptions. They lack consecutive and elaborate scenes. The *Iliad* is opposed to all that."

It may be claimed by "higher critics" that poets are not proper judges of poetry, and that professors of belles-lettres are not competent to pass on a literary question. Surely the historians of Greece have a right to be heard on this historical question. Grote declared that

"the attempt to resolve the *Iliad* into separate unities had signally failed. There is no sense in taking a work that is actually a unity and declaring that it originated from atoms, not originally designed for the places they now occupy. The *Odyssey* was molded at one projection. Very few passages of the *Iliad* are completely separable. Are we to be imposed upon by the folly that Onamocritus and his fellows put lays together and were the first to create the idea of the *Iliad*? There is some plausibility in these reasonings of Wolf so long as the discrepancies are looked upon as the whole of the case, but they are not the whole of the case. Wolf explained gaps and contradictions, but he explained nothing else, and he introduced greater difficulties than he removed."

Mahaffy of Dublin admitted that there was a reaction toward the belief in the unity of the *Iliad*.

"Comparative philology [he says] has been made more of than positive Greek. The actual effect of criticism on the intellectual world has been slight compared with its pretensions. The tradition of antiquity is large and straightforward from the beginning. We are asked to believe that twelve thousand lines came down unbroken, the delight of all the ages, without a personality of its own. Supreme poets have always appeared at times of vigorous national movement."

J. B. Bury, in his history published in 1900, says:

"In the ninth century B.C., a poet of supreme genius came into being, the real Homer. He was no mere stringer together of ancient lays, he was the father of the epic. His was conscious art, as great poetry always is."

Vol. LXV. No. 259. 10

In several numbers of the *Contemporary Review* for 1905, Dr. Emil Reich pours out his contempt on the "higher critics" of Homer.

"They have tried to refine grand old Homer with their uncouth learning and counting syllables. The redactors covered up their compiling and cobbling the best way they could, but the higher critics were too sharp for them."

The protest of the poets, essayists, and historians, of men of the broader view, against the theories of Wolf and Lachmann, was not without effect on philologists. When they saw the foundations of Wolf's theory swept away one by one, they gradually abandoned the theory itself. The discomfiture of the Romantic school, when it applied its theory of folk songs to German epic poetry, was complete. In 1855, A. Holtzmann defended the unity of the *Nibelungenlied* against Lachmann. He appealed to the general public to say if the lay theory was not degrading to a great poet. Zacher, in his reply, said:

"This question can be solved only by specialists. Lachmann's writings are esoteric. You cannot understand him even if you are well posted. He is so esoteric that you must converse with him before you can understand him."

When Lachmann died, Jacob Grimm in a funeral oration took occasion to dissent from his treatment both of the *Nibelungenlied* and of the *Iliad*, saying, that with longer reflection he had ceased to share Lachmann's point of view.

The great German weeklies *Germania* and the *Literatur Centralblatt* inaugurated against Lachmann's theory a campaign in which the public journals generally joined. In 1887, J. Müller claimed that nearly all critics of the *Nibelungenlied* were opposed to Lachmann's views. Two years later, W. Müller pronounced Lachmann's position false, and in 1896 Madrousky announced that Lachmann's hypothesis had no advocate.

With this utter defeat of Lachmann's scheme, as applied to the *Nibelungenlied*, the defeat of the same scheme as applied to the *Iliad* was inevitable, and the attack upon it was made by Greek scholars as soon as it was announced. Ruhnken, to whom Wolf dedicated the *Prolegomena*, wrote:

"While I read I assent, but when I close the book I withdraw my assent; after repeated reading, I can hardly say that you are right."

Wytttenbach, the author of an index to Greek literature, called Wolf "a bag of wind." Humboldt wrote:

"Your argument is too subjective; you should have begun with proofs of variety of style and speech."

Heyne insisted that the theory was only "a possibility, a straw on the ocean, not a vessel to cross in." Boeckh at once withdrew his support of the new theory when he discovered Greek inscriptions before the time of Solon.

Crusius, who wrote an introduction to Müller's introduction to Homer, intimated that

"the voices against the old faith of all Greece are not trusted. We don't see how the one poem came from so many poets and how art came from nature. A Homer of the time of Pisistratus is as strange as one four hundred years earlier. Wolf's torso was the admiration and vexation of the learned. Then began a slaughter of the *Iliad*. Every one cut and hacked it to pieces."

But as the barriers of rationalism gave way to orthodoxy again, so the extravagances of the Wolfians gave way to the old view of Homer. Ernest Friedländer, in his "*Homeric Criticism*," refers to

"the almost microscopical observation of *cæsuras* and *hiatuses*." "It is lamentable [he says] that so much industry and care should be devoted to the discovery of these petty facts that prove nothing at all. So much is said to have come from others, perhaps not a word was Homer's. The idea of dating a lay by the use of a preposition found in it."

H. Lehrs, who wrote on the "*Unity of the Odyssey*," declared,

"It is not right to rob Greek literature of the high development of the Epic. The planning of a great poem with such calm dignity is impossible to many, and never granted except to the most gifted and noble individuals of our race."

Weisse said:

"It is easier to suppose that one wrote all the lays, for how could so many agree on the same theme. Magisterial utterances will terrify none but children. Those who look for contradictions are sure to find them. Lachmann separates the genuine from the false according to his taste."

Visher, author of a work on æsthetics that appeared in 1845, made the keen remark that

"Homer would never have been honored as he has been if he had been the author of disconnected lays."

Krüger, editor of a Greek grammar, mentioned the fact that "the *particles* of the Iliad, are so rich and full of art that they presuppose a preparatory period of a *thousand* years." G. W. Nitzsch, who devoted his *life* to the overthrow of Wolf's theory, said in 1853 that "no poem like the Iliad was ever made up out of *many* shorter poems. It is not patch-work, but the finest product of art." George F. Schoemann, who wrote a book on Greek antiquities in 1855, announced that

"Grote had silenced forever the opinion that there was no Iliad before Pisistratus."

H. Düntzer, who returned from the exposition of Goethe to that of Homer in 1866, said that

"the Iliad is not a melting down of many little songs, but the creation of one inspired soul. Here is a great poetical unity, developed from a germ and all its parts lead symmetrically to the whole. This dark partizanship which cares for victory not of truth, but of its theory, is the worst enemy of progress. Parties are sharply opposed to each other on the arena of blustering ambition. Kirchhoff is blind with passion. Bonitz, who is excellent in dealing with Plato, is one-sided and superficial when he deals with Homer. The lay theorists find it hard to locate the beginning of their lays. Their proposition is contrived to suit their hypothesis. They make an effort to support their theory, not to understand the Iliad. The ancients knew of no

lay writers. The first condition of criticism is regard for tradition, but they have no sense for anything except contradiction."

Kammer, who defended the unity of the *Odyssey* against Steinthal and Kirchoff, said in 1873:

"The *Illad* is the known work and new creation of the poet. If Homer had been only a collector of old songs, he would not have had the fame the Greeks and all other nations have given him. Lachmann is onesided and topsyturvy. Pisistratus was not a redactor. Homer wrote the *Illad* complete."

G. Bernhardt, author of a sketch of Greek literature, said in 1874:

"No one to-day agrees with Wolf as to the existence of a redactor in the age of Pisistratus. It is easy to cut the *Illad* to pieces, but who could have put it together. The hand that wounds cannot heal. The suggestion of a Pisistratus is hardly to be taken seriously. The critics cannot get rid of Homer. It is inconceivable that such art and unity could have been the work of many. There is no such thing as an unorganic product put together by a redactor. The great epic is an organic product. All the great Greek writers from Pindar to the Alexandrians knew of only one Homer. Wolf rejected historical tradition and overvalued a vague testimony in favor of a prejudiced opinion of his own. Wolf's solution is an hypothesis, and no hypothesis settles all difficulties. Nowhere is more care needed, nowhere are opinions more apt to change."

The learned Dane Madvig, in his introduction to Nutzhorn's volume on the *Iliad*, observes:

"Wolf did not prove his point thoroughly, but put higher criticism into a false rut. He did not explain facts clearly and comprehensively, nor did he lead to a conclusion. He questioned the genuineness of some of Cicero's orations and ignored linguistic and æsthetic phenomena. He was superficial and erroneous. He treated Homer negatively. He had no positive construction. He did not study the age of Pisistratus to see whether it was a literary age capable of doing what he claimed Pisistratus did. I do not hesitate to say that everything points to the unity of the *Illad*, and that it was known as a whole from the first. Wolf and others overlook in a remarkable way the development of Greek literature. This literature presupposes the *Iliad* as a whole. Unity is the only explanation of the uninterrupted progress from stage to stage and of the easy tone of the narration. Wolf has an unclear view of popular poetry. In-

dividuals produce popular poetry as all other. The form of the Iliad depended on the people and the age when it appeared. Occasionally a strong and imposing mind appears surrounded by a crowd of parasites, who by imitation create an impression of originality. Many thoughtful people do not recognize this fashion of opinion, but, half in fear and half in irony, they avoid it. The majority of German philologists are not against my view. Lachmann applied a peculiar, arbitrary, æsthetic standard to the Iliad. The Iliad gives law to the Epic, but, according to him, it violates this law. That which delighted generations of Greeks may have been composed by a Greek. There seems to be a microscopic search for disagreements and strange reasoning as to what the poet must have regarded as probable or not. Boldest conclusions are drawn inductively from short, broken, self-contradictory statements. The power of unity in the Iliad itself overwhelms all these objections."

Nutzhorn, whom Madvig thus introduced, traces the two schools of criticism to two principles: one of nature, the other of personality; one of development, the other of preconceived plan; one of patch-work, the other of art work. The erroneous starting-point leads to a false goal, he says. "Critics examine not the Iliad, but opinions concerning the Iliad. Poetry is for poets, not for philologists with their petty spirit." In 1874, Volkman reviewed the "history of the higher criticism of Homer," and declared that

"all of Wolf's ideas had been proved untenable. Differences of language are accidental, criteria not capable of leading to any agreement as to the age of the different parts of the Iliad. Writing is an original act of the human spirit, the foundation of all culture, and there can be no civilization without it. The argument that, because other literatures begin with the ballad, therefore Greek literature does, is taking and apparently probable, yet on nearer examination proves untenable."

J. S. Blackie, the learned Scotch professor, said:

"Germans got into the habit of pulling all literary documents to pieces, as a sacrifice to a fixed idea or as an exhibition of erudite ingenuity. As devil's advocates they *found* flaws in all written traditions or *made* them. The mighty gaps in the Iliad, that Wolf found, proved to be superficial scratches, and one or two small cracks, which neither shake the cohesion of the parts nor annihilate the unity of the plan. It is a titanic exhibition of fruitless learning due

to a peculiar vice of the German intellect, analogous to the curious and profound subtlety in legal minds, which makes them incapable of dealing with broad questions. Much learning has made them super-subtle, curious, captious, impractical. They are trained to magnify differences till they have lost the sense of likeness. They explain the process by which the web was woven when they discover a few rents and expose a few patches. Vulgar rhapsodists may have sown a beggar's patch upon the purple robe of Homer. The *Iliad* must be a unity or a vamping. Wolf impugns that fine coherence of parts, that subtle delicacy of one presiding soul, which is felt and acknowledged in Milton, Angelo, and Shakespeare. This unity exists because the poem exists, and makes the impression of one great whole. It is not enough to prove petty flaws and trivial incongruities or a few interpolations to mar the beauty. There are interpolations in 'Iphigenia in Aulis,' but Euripides is the author. Koechly's elaborate use of the Homeric concordance to throw suspicion on the genuineness of any passage has not produced the slightest effect on my mind. If the general plan of the book be maintained, the special attacks lose their point. Scholarly criticism is more than ingenious conjecture. We have the tradition of long centuries in our favor and not one substantial reason against us. Possession is nine points of the law, and he who wishes to shake an old received doctrine out of its consistency must be prepared to bring something more weighty to bear against it than clever guesses and well-devised possibilities. The *Iliad* was not manufactured by certain literary joiners and dovetailers in the age of Pisistratus. Spectacle erudition and critical ingenuity fight a battle against poetic insight, healthy human feeling, and common sense. Wolf is in my judgment almost altogether wrong. Homer could no more have invented Agamemnon than he could have invented Jupiter. If separate materials existed before Homer, the bond that connected them also existed. Wolf treats too lightly the tradition that Cadmus introduced letters long before the days of Homer. The issue depends upon the actual discovery of insignificant gaps and clumsy joinings, which the sharp eyes of Wolf and the microscopic inspection of others boast to have discovered everywhere in what to Aristotle appeared the very compact and well-jointed framework of the *Iliad*. If anywhere among human compositions we have a grand imaginative plan and a grand consecutive execution of that plan, we have them here. This *Iliad* gives as plain an impression of unity as *Paradise Lost* or Haydn's *Creation*. The Greeks did not honor Pisistratus as Wolf does. If there are fissures in the poem, then the *Iliad* is a piece of cunning patchwork, not more genuine than the *Fingal* of McPherson. Wolf is altogether wrong in starting with the presumption that if possible a want of

originality is to be supposed. This perverse principle accounts for a great amount of that impertinent and illogical ingenuity which has been wasted on this. No one can persuade me that there were so many great poets in Greece and that all wrote on the same theme. Unless a matter is satisfactorily proven to me, I am not accustomed to follow the authority of other men, however learned they may be. Names do not frighten me, nor a great consensus of them, nor the confidence with which they express their opinion. They say that the *Iliad* was made from many lays. If their divisions are examined according to the rules of poetic art, they appear of no value. I say that all the *Iliad* came from one fountain."

W. Christ, who edited the *Iliad* in 1885, says:

"The faith of two thousand years in Homer as poet of all time was shattered by Wolf, but now nearly all have abandoned him and believe in an original plan to account for the wonderful unity of the *Iliad*. One great thought must have come through one great personality. The statistical philologists of to-day prove wonders by counting forms and words."

To the same effect J. Müller wrote in 1887:

"In the delicate question of literary criticism, enumerations and catalogues of words do not suffice to give objective certainty."

Butcher and Lang recognized the unity of Homer's epics, and D. B. Munro, in 1891, says that

"The *Odyssey* is the work of one poet and is a connected logical masterpiece of construction. The story of Pisistratus is merely a mythical anecdote. The *a priori* improbability of Lachmann's theory is so great as to outweigh any arguments in its favor."

S. Reinach, the orientalist, says:

"The higher critics have robbed Homer of his character, pilloried him as an impudent plunderer of other men's wits, and finally proved that he never existed at all. Because a man can read Greek or French, is he capable of writing a history of Greece or France? Only historians can handle history. The critics make up for insufficient evidence by the incantation of high-sounding names, and impose on the public by the display of the paraphernalia of erudition."

Leaf and Byfield, in their edition of Homer in 1898, said:

"The Achæans, before the Dorian invasion of 1000 B.C., left us as their heirloom the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. These poems have

often been compared with ballad poetry of other nations, it is now generally recognized that this comparison is radically false. They are not the outcome of a young and primitive people, but rather of a civilization which was approaching its fall."

R. B. Jebb, in a recent volume, says:

"The language of the *Iliad* and the substance of the *Iliad* testify to its high antiquity. Here Mount Ida lifts her head in the East, and there the peak of Samothrace arises in the West. The wheat, the reeds, the elms, the willows, and the tamarisks, the cry of the heron, the dark plumage of the eagle, and the flight of cranes are here, as in Homer's day. The Greeks knew the Phœnicians as early as 1100 B.C. It seems unlikely that the Greeks, with their bright wit, their quickness in taking hints, should have allowed many centuries to have gone by before they caught up this art of writing from Phœnicians. The literature of Greece and Europe begins with Homer's poems, which are works of mature poetic art. They are united in a form and style all their own—they have the freshness and simplicity of a primitive age, and yet are free from the defects of primitive literature. There is nothing in them that is grotesque, ignoble, slow or monotonous. Matthew Arnold characterizes the style of the *Iliad* as rapid, plain in thought, plain in diction, and noble. Cowper is not rapid in his translation of the *Iliad*, nor is Chapman plain in thought in his. Pope is not plain in diction, and Morris is not noble in his version. The general result reached by criticism is this: the original nucleus of the *Iliad* was a series of lays by a great poet who fixed the main incidents of the story, and left to others room to enlarge and complete it. The *Iliad* stood as to-day before 770 B.C."

The deathblow was given to the theory of Wolf and Lachmann when the hieroglyphs of Egypt and the cuneiform tablets of Nineveh were deciphered, and especially when the ruins of Troy, Mycænæ, and Cnossos were explored by Schliemann and Evans. These men opened up a history that was unknown to Wolf.

C. L. Roth, in his Greek history, 1891, says:

"Homer gives a picture of the Greeks in the twelfth century B.C. Schliemann had revealed the life of the still earlier Mycænæan Age. His excavations prove, as the *Iliad* does, that there was a common culture in Greek lands. The ornaments of Mycænæ protect Homer's description of the shield of Achilles from the charge of being fantastic."

N. Koehler wrote in 1897:

"We know now by excavation what Herodotus and Thucydides knew only by tradition."

Basil L. Gildersleeve, at the Philological Congress at Philadelphia in 1900, in referring to the changes of view that had taken place in fifty years, spoke of "the reinstallation of Homer, pen in hand."

V. Berard spent years in the eastern Mediterranean. With modern charts and instructions to seamen he traced with his own eyes the course of the voyage of Ulysses as unfolded in the Odyssey. In 1902 he published his conclusions in two sumptuous volumes.

"We use the entire poem [he says] as if really the personal work of a Homer whose every concept and word must be respected. I believe that Wolf's theories have had their day, and that we must return to an explanation more human. With our marine charts and nautical instructions we have proved the minute exactness and faithfulness of the Odyssey. Crete has furnished a thousand inscribed bricks in both monumental and cursive script. Ramses II., the Pharaoh of the oppression, mentions the Achæans. Scarabs of Queen Ti, as early as 1430 B.C., have been found both at Crete and at Mycæne."

In reviewing Berard's volumes, Michael Breal thus refers to the Homeric question:

"The debate was ended, when the excavations raised the question again. The excavations proved the truth and reality of the epic. Under the Troy of Homer there are layers of earlier civilizations."

The *Classical Review* for 1904, in an article by E. A. Gardner, says:

"Since Doerpfeld's book on Troy appeared, the most sceptical can no longer doubt that the walls of the sixth period must represent the Troy of the Illad."

The *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1905, remarks:

"It will probably be admitted that destructive methods of criticism are growing out of date and out of place in connection with the Odyssey. Not only is the poet literally exact in his description of his

hero's wanderings, but every bit of knowledge provided by the antiquary, the traveler, and the excavator can now be added to the proofs of Homer's accuracy. We believe the time has come when broader views of the Homeric question may be taken with advantage to every one who cares for poetry or ancient civilization. Doctor Paley still maintains Wolf's thrice dead theory, but he is a melancholy exception."

W. M. Ramsay writes in 1905:

"No scholar would now employ the argument that the composition of the Iliad must belong to a comparatively late day, because such a continuous poem could not come into existence without the ready use of writing,—an argument which formerly seemed to tell strongly against the early date assumed by tradition for its origin. The difficulty originated in our ignorance. No doubt can now be entertained that writing was known and familiarly practised in the eastern Mediterranean lands long before the date to which Greek tradition assigned the composition of the great poems. A. J. Evans, at Cnossos, has found ink written inscriptions on vases 1800 years B.C., and he infers the existence of writing on papyrus or other perishable matter, since ink was not made merely for terra cotta vases. Paper was used in Egypt 3000 years B.C. Ignorance of writing points not to a primitive, but to a degraded race."

J. D. Seymour, in his "Life in the Homeric Age," 1907, maintains:

"The early elements of the Homeric poems may be as old as the close of the second millennium B.C. Helbig in his great work on Homer's Poems as elucidated by the monuments declares that for his purposes he was obliged to treat the poems as a unit. Of recent years scholars are abandoning the view of Lachmann. The stamp of a great personality seems to be on each of the two great poems."

Andrew Lang, in *Blackwood's* for January, 1908, says that there is "nothing more striking than the uniform splendor with which the Iliad is written."

I have thus traced the fortunes of the "higher criticism" of Homer since the appearance of Wolf's *Prolegomena* a hundred years ago. It suggests an interesting parallel to the course of the "higher criticism" of Moses since the appearance of the *Prolegomena* of Wellhausen. Both begin with

philologists who scorn theology; both start with a large supply of assumptions. When Liddon asked Döllinger what he thought of Wellhausen, he replied:

"I counted the assumptions he made until I could stand it no longer, and I put the book down."

Both men broke with ancient and universal tradition; both invented editors and redactors, one in the age of Pisistratus, the other in the age of Ezra. Both built up a scheme upon a single statement, which they perverted,—one upon a casual remark of Cicero's, the other upon the account of the discovery of the book of the law. Both divided and subdivided the text, and proclaimed interpolations and contradictions in a subjective, arbitrary, and self-contradictory manner. Both furnished editions with the original documents distinguished by different types. Both excelled in the use of the concordance and the mechanical tabulation of words. Both obtained control of the chairs of universities, and boasted that the scholarship of the world was with them. Both had to face the difficulty of accounting by their hypothesis for the fame of the book and author; and the further difficulty of supposing that writers of a later age could have made up ancient history so surprisingly well. Both faced the difficulty which Moritz Haupt admitted, namely, the impossibility of tracing step by step how the idea of one author arose, how gradually the manifold origin was forgotten, and when the original parts appeared. Finally, both were overwhelmed by the discovery of ancient literatures, a discovery that traversed every position that they had taken. The friends of Homer have silenced the "higher critics" of the *Iliad*; the friends of Moses may silence the "higher critics" of the Pentateuch, if they will.

ARTICLE IX.

THE PROGRESS AND PRESENT STATUS OF
TRI-CHURCH UNION.

BY LUCIEN C. WARNER, LL.D., NEW YORK CITY.

THE meeting of the Congregational Council at Cleveland last October and the more recent meeting of the National Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church at Pittsburgh in May make the present a favorable opportunity to review the effort that has been made to effect a union of the Congregational, United Brethren, and Methodist Protestant denominations.

The first General Council of the three denominations was held at Dayton, Ohio, in February, 1906. At this Council a declaration of faith was adopted, the outline of a plan of union agreed upon, and committees appointed to work out this plan in more complete details. A second General Council was held in Chicago in March, 1907, attended by over two hundred delegates representing the three bodies. At this Council definite articles of agreement for the united churches were reported by the Committee of Sixty-three, and after three days' discussion were adopted with great enthusiasm and without a dissenting vote, these articles covering all the points necessary for a working organization.

The Declaration of Faith as adopted at the meeting of the General Council at Dayton, Ohio, was reaffirmed and adopted without change. This has already been printed in this magazine for April, 1906. The Articles of Agreement as adopted at Chicago are as follows:—

ARTICLE I.

"The name of this organization shall be The United Churches, comprising the Congregational Churches, the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, and the Methodist Protestant Church.

ARTICLE II.

"For the purpose of realizing the fellowship of the churches, and to provide for their coöperation, they shall be organized into District Associations, Annual Conferences, and a National Council.

ARTICLE III.

"District Associations shall have their boundaries, composition, duties, and prerogatives defined by the Annual Conferences, of which they shall be subdivisions.

ARTICLE IV.

"1. State Associations of the Congregational Churches and Annual Conferences of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ and of the Methodist Protestant Church shall be recognized and continued as Annual Conferences under this organization until such time as the National Council may, by the consent of the parties concerned, arrange new boundaries. They shall have the right to maintain intact their present modes of organization and operation in local affairs, but they shall be known and styled as Annual Conferences of the United Churches, comprising the Congregational Churches, the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, and the Methodist Protestant Church; and they shall make effective this union by coöperating with the National Council in all matters affecting the general interests of the churches.

"2. Two or more State Associations or Annual Conferences may, by mutual consent, unite to form one Annual Conference, with power to make rules and regulations for its organization and operation in local affairs.

"3. All Annual Conferences shall have power to make rules and regulations for their organization and for the conduct of all their local affairs.

"4. Ordination to the ministry and ministerial standing shall be in Annual Conferences, except where it is preferred to delegate or leave these to local bodies.

ARTICLE V.

"The National Council of Congregational Churches and the General Conferences of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ and of the Methodist Protestant Church shall continue their legal existence as long as may be deemed necessary.

ARTICLE VI.

"1. The National Council of the United Churches, comprising the

Congregational Churches, the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, and the Methodist Protestant Church, shall assemble in on the third Thursday in May,, and regularly thereafter on the same day every four years. It shall be composed of representatives as follows: Each Annual Conference shall be entitled to one ministerial and one lay representative for every five thousand members and major fraction thereof, within its bounds, to be elected as itself may prescribe. *Provided*, that each Annual Conference shall be entitled to at least one ministerial and one lay representative; and *provided*, that the National Council may at any time change the ratio of representation.

"2. A majority of the representatives in attendance shall constitute a quorum of the National Council, and ordinary questions shall be determined by a majority vote; but no vote shall be passed contravening or modifying this Act of Union unless a majority of the representatives from each denomination represented in the union agree thereto. And whenever requested by a majority of the representatives of any one of these denominations, the vote shall be by denominations, and a majority of each shall be necessary to carry the question pending.

"3. The National Council shall elect at every quadrennial meeting a president, a secretary, a treasurer, and such other officers as may be deemed necessary, who shall hold office until their successors are elected, and who shall perform the usual duties of their office and such other duties in the service of the churches as the Council may determine.

"4. The National Council at its first meeting shall proceed to organize societies and boards for the conduct of the general business of the churches, such as missionary, evangelistic, educational, church building, Sunday-school, publishing, and other benevolent work; or it may adopt for any of these purposes societies and boards now existing, if a majority of the representatives of each denomination consent.

"5. In organizing these societies and boards the National Council shall name for membership therein those who now constitute such societies and boards in the denominations represented in this union wherever similar societies and boards exist; and in others membership shall be distributed among the denominations in due proportion. This arrangement, however, shall be only temporary and for the purpose of facilitating the combination of the interests involved and preventing confusion and interruption in the work of any existing society. As soon as may be, consistently with the interest of the work, the membership of these societies shall be reduced to a basis of economy and efficiency of administration, and the National Council shall at every quadrennial meeting determine how many and who shall constitute these societies and boards.

"6. All societies and boards now existing in the churches represented in this union shall, as soon as possible after the adoption of this Act of Union, and the organization by the National Council of the societies and boards indicated in this article, cease their active operations in collecting funds from the churches. They shall hand over to the corresponding societies and boards organized in pursuance of this article the income of all their funds and the use of the property and equipment now used in the prosecution of their work, wherever this may be lawfully done pursuant to their corporate purpose; and in general it is understood that they will coöperate in carrying out the true intent and purpose of this union, to consolidate all the active operations of the three denominations in general church work. But nothing herein contained shall direct nor authorize any diversion of trust funds from the spirit of the purpose for which such funds were donated.

"7. The societies and boards organized by the National Council shall meet at the call of the president of the Council as early as practicable after the adjournment of the Council, and elect officers. They shall secure charters in pursuance of the instructions of this article and appoint secretaries and agents for the prosecution of the work assigned them. They shall arrange for the visitation of churches and Annual Conferences by their agents in the interest of their work, and take full charge of all the work now performed by corresponding societies and boards in the denominations represented in this union. They shall make a full report to each regular meeting of the National Council, and shall be responsible to that body.

"8. The National Council shall make rules and regulations for the conduct of its business and for the prosecution of all the general work of the church; it shall counsel, warn, and appeal to the churches on questions of religious and administrative concern, and in general shall represent the churches; *provided*, that nothing be done in contravention of this Act of Union.

ARTICLE VII.

"Ministers in good standing in any denomination represented in this union shall be ministers in this organization. Licentiates shall retain their standing for the period of their licensure. Ministers under censure must look to their own denomination for relief.

ARTICLE VIII.

"This union shall be consummated by the adoption of this Act of Union by the denominations represented, in accordance with their rules and regulations; and when the moderator of the National Council of Congregational Churches, the bishops of the General Conference of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, and the president of the General Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church

shall have announced that this Act of Union has been adopted by the proper bodies representing their respective denominations, these officers shall unite in filling the blank in Article VI., Section 1, fixing the place and time for the meeting of the National Council, and publish the same, together with a call for the election of representatives, according to Article VI."

The name is long and cumbersome, but for legal reasons it seemed advisable to include the full name of each of the present societies.

The central object of the union is stated in the second article. District associations, annual conferences, and a national council are organized "for the purpose of realizing the fellowship of the churches, and to provide for their coöperation." It is not a central legislative body, but a means of orderly coöperation for the purpose of mutual helpfulness and efficient service.

ANNUAL CONFERENCES.

As described in Articles III. and IV., the plan of union is to be worked out through the annual conferences of the three bodies corresponding to the state associations of the Congregational Churches. These are to be left intact as at present existing in the three churches until such time as they shall by mutual consent decide to merge together or to change their boundaries. In some instances this would very likely be brought about within a few months or years, and in other instances a much longer period would elapse. In any community where they prefer to retain their present separate annual conferences they can do so, and yet all meet together in the same National Council and coöperate in their benevolences through the same national societies. By this method the United Brethren and Methodist Protestants might continue their present plan of assigning ministers to the churches each year without affecting the Congregational churches located in the same state

and yet be in fellowship and coöperation in the general activities and benevolences of the united churches. This seems to be a very happy solution of a somewhat difficult problem. The individual customs and wishes of each denomination are respected and protected, and yet all are brought together for general fellowship and coöperation.

INDIVIDUAL CHURCHES NOT AFFECTED.

There has been some inquiry as to the effect of the union on the individual church. Each of the three denominations is naturally attached to its own methods of conducting church service and managing church affairs. A careful examination of the Articles of Agreement reveals no encroachments on the liberty of any individual church. The Act of Union is designed to affect the churches, not in their individual activities, but only in their coöperation with each other for mutual helpfulness and for the better administration of their benevolent activities. The individual church remains unaffected as to name, ownership, control of its property, the selection of its pastor, and the free administration of its own affairs.

There is, however, a strong and rapidly growing feeling among Congregationalists that better provision should be made than at present for the propagation of their church polity, the orderly conduct of their church business, and especially for giving systematic aid to such churches as may be in temporary need of assistance. While the present polity has worked well with strong, self-reliant churches which are able to stand alone, it has often broken down with feeble churches which frequently need advice or help in time of special adversity.

This desire for better organization is already finding expression in many of our states in the appointment of com-

mittees on pastoral supply, and in some cases in the appointment of a salaried superintendent who shall look after the welfare of any church needing temporary assistance. It is not the exercise of authority by a central hierarchy, but the offer of voluntary assistance which in almost every instance needy churches are very glad to accept.

The tendency of all Protestant denominations is gradually toward each other. Essentials are emphasized more, and non-essentials less. The itinerary is less mandatory now in all churches which practise it than it was forty years ago, and it seems not improbable that it will finally become in form what it is now largely in fact,—an advisory action to the church and minister interested. On the other hand, the Congregationalists have no organized method of bringing together churches without a pastor, and pastors without a church; and it is generally recognized that an agency for this purpose, with advisory powers, would be of great service to the denomination. It, therefore, seems probable that the natural development of the three denominations will in a comparatively short time bring them into substantial harmony on this most marked point of difference.

THE BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES.

The most radical departure from the present Congregational practice in the proposed Articles of Agreement is the change in the control of the benevolent societies. The six societies of the Congregational Church grew up independent of united church action, and for the most of their history they have remained independent bodies not directly representative of the churches of the denomination. The fact that the societies looked to the churches for their support has kept them responsive to the wishes of the churches; but it is generally

recognized that the relation is not the proper one, and all of the societies must soon become directly responsible to the representatives of the churches. The proposed Articles of Agreement provide for having all of the societies directly responsible to the churches as represented in the National Council. The propriety and advantages of this arrangement are so manifest that few will be found to criticise it.

ACTION OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH.

The Act of Union as agreed upon at Chicago was referred to the three denominations to be considered by them at the next regular meetings of their national organizations. The National Council of the Congregational Churches was the first of the three national bodies to meet, and the report of the General Council came before them for consideration at their meeting in Cleveland last October. The council referred the report to a special committee of twenty-eight. This committee gave public hearings for several days to all who wished to present their views, and over ninety delegates spoke before the committee. After very full discussion and consideration the committee presented a report to the Council signed by twenty-four members, which was all who were present at the Council when the report was completed. This report, which, after some discussion, was adopted by the Council, was as follows:—

“REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF TWENTY-EIGHT.

“The National Council of the Congregational Churches of the United States, in session at Cleveland, Ohio, October 8-17, 1907, having heard a remarkable volume of testimony from all parts of the country, hereby records its conviction that our churches will go forward to consummate union with the Church of the United Brethren in Christ and the Methodist Protestant Church.

“We recognize in the Act of Union adopted by the General Council of the United Churches at Chicago the fundamental principles by

which such union must be accomplished. The aim of that act is the desire of our churches. The act provides for a representative council of the united churches, combines their benevolent activities, and conserves their vested interests. It makes provision for the gradual amalgamation of their state and local organizations, leaving the people of each locality free to choose their own times and methods for the completion of such unions. It contemplates, as the result of a continued fellowship of worship and work, a blending of the three denominations into one. This is the end to which the Act of Union looks forward, and these are essential means of its accomplishment.

"We recognize that, for the consummation of this union, each denomination is prepared to modify its administrative forms. Among our ministers and churches there have arisen divergent opinions both as to the interpretation of certain clauses and as to the effect of certain provisions in the Act of Union; while of some details therein proposed important criticisms have been made.

"We recognize, further, that the other church bodies, when they convene for consideration of the Act of Union, may likewise find that certain of its features can be improved.

"We, therefore, invite the other two denominations to unite with us in referring the Act of Union to the General Council of the United Churches, to afford opportunity for perfecting the plan of union; the General Council to report its results to the national body of each denomination.

"We also recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:—

"1. That the Committee on Comity, Federation, and Unity to be appointed by this Council be authorized to act with representatives of the other two denominations in procuring the reassembling of the General Council of the United Churches, and also to act in behalf of the National Council in aiding the consummation of the proposed union, and in the further advancement of the cause of Comity, Federation, and Unity among various Christian bodies.

"2. That, in case the Committee on Comity, Federation, and Unity find it desirable to add to its members for special service, it have authority to do so.

"3. That our membership in subsequent meetings of the General Council of the United Churches be thoroughly representative of our churches and elected in their state organizations, the securing of such elections on a proper ratio of representation in the various state bodies, and the filling of vacancies, to be in the hands of the Provisional Committee.

"4. That a committee consisting of Rev. Drs. Washington Gladden, William Douglas Mackenzie, and William Hayes Ward be appointed to present this action to the United Brethren and the Methodist Protestant Church."

It will be noted that the only criticism of the plan of union is contained in a single sentence of the third paragraph, and is to the effect that divergent opinions have arisen as to the interpretation of certain clauses and provisions, while important criticisms have been made of some of the details. The report does not state the particulars of these divergent interpretations and criticisms, but most of them may be gathered from the addresses made before the Committee of Twenty-eight. The most important, and the one that found largest expression, was that the annual conference was given too much authority and the district conference too little. The annual conference is authorized to elect delegates to the National Council and to define the boundaries and duties of the district associations. At present the National Council of the Congregational body is composed partly of delegates elected by the state bodies and partly by delegates elected by the local or district associations, and it is thought by many that the local associations, which are nearer to the churches, are more likely to be truly representative of them. The principal argument in favor of the method proposed is that it is more simple to carry into effect. There are necessarily many complications in the attempt to bring three bodies with different plans of organization into one harmonious union, and these will be aggravated by having a complicated system of electing delegates. Confusion will also be likely to arise unless there is a clearly defined definition of the respective duties of the annual conferences and district associations. For these reasons it would be easier in working out the plan of union to accept the method as defined in the report and then later to enlarge the scope and power of the district associations if it were found desirable.

Some have expressed a fear that the autonomy of the in-

dividual church was in danger of invasion. Any such fear comes from reading into the Articles of Agreement a meaning which the authors never intended. This point was fully discussed by the committee that prepared the articles and in the General Council at Chicago, and all were agreed that no present right or liberty of the individual church would be surrendered by the Act of Union. As we have explained elsewhere in this article, the union is designed to affect the churches in their coöperative work with other churches and not in their individual activities or control. Besides it would not be possible for any Act of Union of this kind to take away from the church the liberty of action or property rights which it already enjoys.

Objection has been made to the fact that the present national bodies are to continue their legal existence after the union is formed (Article V.), and some have thought that this implies that there is to be no real union. This action was taken solely for the purpose of meeting any legal complications that might arise, and would in no way interfere with the complete union of the denominations in all of their organized activities.

Another objection is that the different annual conferences are permitted to continue indefinitely side by side in the same territory. How could it be otherwise if the union is to be the voluntary act of the different denominations and churches interested? The whole genius and history of each of the three denominations is opposed to any act of coercion. The churches in any locality must be left free to continue their present organization or to unite with those of the other denominations as they shall prefer. It is probable that in many of the states the union would be brought about almost as soon as the bodies are brought together, but, if in any state several

years should elapse, it will in no way interfere with the fellowship and coöperation, which are the chief ends sought by the union.

Except for the criticism of the unimportant details which we have mentioned, the report of the Committee of Twenty-eight was highly commendatory to the plan of union. It states that "the Council hereby records its conviction that our churches will go forward to consummate union with the churches of the United Brethren in Christ and the Methodist Protestant Church." It recognizes in the Act of Union "the fundamental principles by which such union must be accomplished. The aim of that Act is the desire of our churches." It recommends the reassembling of the General Council of the United Churches for "perfecting the plan of union." It appoints a new Committee on Comity, Federation, and Unity to "act in behalf of the National Council in aiding the consummation of the proposed union," and, finally it appoints a special committee, consisting of Doctors Washington Gladden, William Douglas Mackenzie and William Hayes Ward, to present this action to the United Brethren and Methodist Protestant churches.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POLITY.

Even more significant than the report of the Committee of Twenty-eight was the action of the Council upon the report of the Committee on Polity. This committee was appointed three years ago by the Council at Des Moines, and brought in a series of eleven resolutions designed to unify and strengthen the Congregational churches in their organic and coöperative activity. After full discussion, and with a separate vote upon each resolution, all of these recommendations were adopted by the Council with substantial unanimity. The

first resolution recommends the adoption of the name "Annual Conferences," for the local organizations, and "District Associations" for the local organizations, thus securing uniformity of name throughout the denomination and adopting the nomenclature proposed in the "Act of Union" with the other denominations. It is also recommended that increased responsibility be placed upon the district associations, so that they may perform many of the functions now referred to special councils of the churches. The tenth and eleventh recommendations are so important that we give them entire.

"X. That the state organizations become legally incorporated bodies; and that under a general superintendent and such boards as they may create, and acting in coöperation with committees of local associations and churches, they provide for and direct the extension of church work, the planting of churches, the mutual oversight and care of all self-sustaining as well as missionary churches, and other missionary and church activities, to the end that closer union may insure greater efficiency without curtailing local independence.

"XI. That the administration of the benevolent interests of the churches be directed by the representatives of the churches in national organization, and that this Council appoint a commission of fifteen, including a representative from each of our benevolent societies, who shall report at its next regular meeting such an adjustment of these societies to the body of the churches represented in this Council as shall secure such direction, care being taken to safeguard existing constitutional provisions of these societies and the present membership of their boards of control, but also to lodge hereafter, the creation and continuance of these administrative boards in the suffrage of the representatives of the churches."

It will thus be seen that the Council by its action at Cleveland has already adopted several of the most important changes involved in accepting the Act of Union, including increased responsibility by the district associations and annual conferences and such a re-organization of our benevolent societies as shall provide that "the benevolent interests of our churches be directed by the representatives of the churches in national organization."

ACTION OF THE METHODIST PROTESTANT CHURCH.

Since the above was in type, the Quadrennial Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church has been held in Pittsburgh. At this meeting, overtures for union were received from the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, then in session in Baltimore, from which church the Methodist Protestants had separated in 1828. This proposal is part of a general scheme which seeks to unite all of the different bodies of the Methodist name or polity in this country, and includes also an invitation to the United Brethren Church.

With this new proposition before them, the Methodist Protestant Conference adopted the following resolutions:—

“That we express our affectionate esteem for the brethren of the Congregational Church and for the deep interest they have shown in the movement for church union; but that we deem it inadvisable at this time to send back the Act of Union for revision.

“That we respond heartily to the proposal of the Methodist Episcopal Church, not unmindful of the difficulties to be overcome before a satisfactory conclusion can be reached, but ready to go as far and as rapidly in consummating a universal Methodism as the interests and integrity of our own denomination will permit, and to pray continually for the full realization of their and our hope.

“That a commission, consisting of nine members, be appointed by this conference for the purpose of meeting with a like commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of the Methodist Episcopal Church South and of all other Methodist churches in this country, to promote and complete so far as may be possible the reunion of Methodists in America.

“That since we have had such assurances from the United Brethren Church of their cordial feeling for us and their deep interest in church union, we hereby empower this commission to meet with a like commission of the United Brethren Church, with the view of promoting organic union with them and enlisting them in this movement.

“That this commission shall report to the next General Conference.”

This action of the Methodist Protestants probably closes the effort for union between the Congregational, United Brethren,

and Methodist Protestant denominations. If, however, this effort proves in any measure instrumental in bringing about the larger union of the different branches of the Methodist Church, it will many times repay the time and labor which have been spent. The spirit of union is growing in modern Christian churches, and there is much ground for the hope that this spirit may lead to the gradual bringing together of all religious bodies which profess the name of Christ.

ARTICLE X.

EVOLUTION AND THE MIRACULOUS.¹

BY PROFESSOR GABRIEL CAMPBELL, HANOVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE.

IN large measure, Philosophy has to do with open questions; indeed, with discussions which there appears no prospect of closing. Here evidently a necessity is upon us. The limitations of our knowledge require us to act, to practise, although we cannot perfectly interpret. Our latest advances in self-consciousness lead us to emphasize belief as justifiable working process.² Kant's Practical Reason is, in the main, a determination of postulates in what we irresistibly believe, and yet cannot theoretically know. Could our present "pragmatic" reasoning reach a unity in its wide diversity of teaching, it would no doubt prove to be outcome more or less of Kant's valuation of practice as surmounting our theoretical intellection.

One of the most difficult, not to say important, of the open questions at the present time concerns the rational validation of the Miraculous. Our decision of this question will depend upon conclusions in several widely extended fields.

Notwithstanding difficulties, let us endeavor to grasp essentials and ascertain valid inferences. Perhaps the most popular

¹ This paper was part of the program of the American Philosophical Association at its annual meeting at Cornell University, December 26-28, 1907.

² For instance, the Presidential Address of Professor John Dewey on "Beliefs and Realities" at the annual meeting of the American Philosophical Association at Harvard University, Philosophical Review for March, 1906.

objection to acceptance of the miraculous is the claim that recent science has cleared away old-fashioned notions, delivering us from fraud and superstition, and establishing religious truth on a sound basis of facts. Science, of course, does not compass all truth. Physics still finds her problems vanishing in metaphysics. The natural looks beyond to the supernatural. We shall best avoid confusion by confining our discussion to recent advancement, and attending at once to the inquiry,

WHAT IS EVOLUTION?

The term "evolution" is not restricted to a technical, defined import. It designates the cosmic process as recognized by our modern scholars in their field work. At the same time it has a philosophic as well as a scientific bearing. Indeed, the evolution theory is not so much a recent discovery as an idea which has itself been evolved in the course of ages. From the earliest times man's studies of nature have involved a theory of progress, of development. Heraclitus declared that permanence is an illusion. Aristotle's familiar comparison of this law of progression in the world to the steps of a ladder was never more suggestive than at the present hour. Let us characterize evolution, then, as the highest critical method, philosophical as well as scientific, by which the world, non-living as well as living, may be estimated.

Perhaps the most noticeable effect of the acceptance of Evolutionism has been the displacement of the idea of fixity. Species had been regarded as permanent and independent. Their production was held to be a matter of specific fiat. Under tenets of evolution, species appear as result of a gradual development, in which selective processes were determinative of the mastery of environing conditions, and, as consequence, of survival in case of those fitted to hold their own and perpet-

uate themselves. As a result, the watchword of the developmental method became variation, instead of fixation. Indeed, so facile did nature prove to be, in her manifold variations, that it has not been possible to compute in advance what definite result would appear. According to Weismann, even germinal selections must be recognized; and our knowledge of the germinal is far from complete. Perhaps it will never be so perfect that we can predict the exact variation. Our theory compels us to assume that species as distinct from temporary varieties have been evolved. What the precise cause of this evolving is we cannot yet discover. Much less can we produce what is veritable species as distinguished from variety. It remains to be seen whether De Vries has evolved any variety which will take its place as new species.¹ If such should be the case he has, no doubt, builded better than he knew, utilizing causes he did not completely comprehend. We assume, however, that the method of development is adequate to explain all changes, that all results involve causation, nature being susceptible of variation, under latent causes, beyond the limit of our accredited scientific knowledge.

In characterizing the world process as an evolving, we do not thereby assume that the process has evolved itself. Darwin was quick to recognize that creation was not displaced by evolution. Indeed, the transcendent glory of the method in its results would necessarily argue the equal glory of its origin. The demand for an originator, all-wise, all-powerful, omnipresent, is only enlarged. The glory of the producer must develop with the glory of the product. Men should not be dazed by the superior brilliance of the cosmic, and

¹ *Experimental Evolution*, by Henry De Varigny, Demonstrator in the Paris Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, page 256. See also Professor Howison's *Limits of Evolution*.

as consequence overlook the supernal Cause. This brings us, then, immediately to the inquiry as to origin. What is a satisfactory interpretation of the cause, the First Cause? Or, more concretely, we come to the question,

WHAT IS GOD?

Here, of course, we must proceed modestly. It remains as true to-day as in the olden time that no man can find out God to perfection.¹ The finding of God is, and is to be, the transcending task of our mental evolution. Let us not, however, underestimate our powers. We should avoid folding our hands and saying, God is unknowable, and, at the same time, confessing ourselves bound to assert what can only be cogently interpreted as progress in the ascertainment of the sovereign ruler of all events. Herbert Spencer could be quite dogmatic in declaring we cannot know God. At the same time he is led to acknowledge attributes of the Eternal Energy which largely substantiate ordinary theistic ideation.² There is extensively current at the present time the claim that God is immanent, so thoroughly identified with the universe as to be indistinguishable. Of course the Supreme Being is omnipresent. We cannot conceive him so limited as to be put into a corner, or seated on a throne, and, in any respect at any point, *in absentia*.

If we regard Him as bound by necessities, where does Necessity find its binding law? God as First Cause cannot be secondary. If any perfection develops in results, perfection at least equal must be resident in the causal. Is any finite being free, God the infinite must be equally free. Do not space and time as aspects of reality simply validate for us the fact

¹ Job xl. 7.

² See article "Herbert Spencer, the Apostle of Agnosticism," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. lxii. (1905) pp. 304-322; also article "Calderswood, the Critic of Agnosticism," vol. lviii. (1901) pp. 580-586.

that something exists everywhere and always? The very thought of causation under evolution carries with it the postulate of adequate origin. The more perfect and potent the source of all energy, the more facile must be his execution. An infinite God can accomplish results with infinite ease. May we not say that his capacity to develop variations exceeds our ken unlimitedly? Let us avoid putting finite measures upon an infinite sovereign. If our Agnosticism tends to Gnosticism, let us keep our Gnosticism sane and workable.

And this will apply to affection as well as to intellection. Unmeasured perfectness doubtless involves unmeasured capacity to love. If love develops in human creatures, how veritably must it dwell in the all-sufficient Producer! Pity, mercy, love; surely these are the transcending attributes of the All-Father, whose children we assuredly are. If we in affection give gifts, how much more may He in whom is every resource. But it is answered, We admit that an infinitely perfect ruler could produce results even with comparative ease. As regards the miraculous, however, we fail to see the necessity for interference. Here the sufficient reason will depend mainly on the question,

WHAT IS MAN?

Is man simply an animal, creature of envioning conditions, or may he, does he, rise above his surroundings, and become sovereign over them? Let us inquire diligently. Can we not trace the evolution of freedom, yes of the consciousness of freedom? What is this struggle for liberty whose history fills to so large extent the literature, fittest to survive, of advancing civilization? Freedom, "the battle-cry of freedom," has been the inspiration of orator and poet, not to say the shout and song of thousands, tens of thousands, who "rally round the Flag," chanting, "Let us die to make men free." "Glory,

Hallelujah." Moreover, the question of free choosing decides man's guilt or innocence before a jury of his peers. Courts of justice are developed on the basal fact that, as long as a man is sane and free, he is responsible for his deeds. As well in the moral world, it is our choices under free will that determine our consciences to condemn or justify. And our compunctions have more of the scathing of a fiery furnace if we find that we have freely travestied the perfect law of a God of perfect justice and affection. Evidently we are free to pervert ourselves beyond limit.

This brings us to inquire further as to man's future. How is he related to the eternal? Is man free to perfect or mar an endless destiny beyond limit? Under habituation he is manifestly builder of abiding results. What about his "restless longing after immortality"? Why does conscience "make cowards of us all"? Is it possible for man to develop permanent impairment? Here we encounter the evolution of man as the religious animal.¹ Is it not man as immortal and free that calls upon a Divine helper? Free and immortal, but with limited knowledge, man appreciates his dependence as deeply as his independence. He becomes conscious that he cannot avoid penalties of his free choosing. Man's eye flashes through illimitable space. He contemplates time as unbeginning and unending. His intellection rises and embraces the celestial. He gains the matchless vision of a helper infinite and divine. His aspirations for the Perfect may be satisfied. He may possess a heavenly kingdom. Yes, he may become a total wreck. Such is the potency, the promise, the peril, of man, the transcendent evolution,

¹Die Entwicklung des religiösen Bewusstseins der Menschheit, Von Professor Dr. A. Lasson. Philosophische Vorträge herausgegeben von der Philosophischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin. Neue Folge. 3 Heft.

“Created half to rise and half to fall;
Great lord of all things, yet a prey to all;
Sole judge of truth, in endless error hurled;
The glory, jest and riddle of the world.”

Before attaining a correct inference as to the miraculous, we must furthermore answer the inquiry,

WHAT IS A MIRACLE?

Miracle does not imply simply what is wonderful, admirable; it has definite reference to what is beyond, beyond the natural. Inasmuch as the field of nature is imperfectly understood, it is impossible to ascertain scientifically where or when the supernatural begins. This, of course, makes the interpretation all the more difficult, and calls for inferences that are most carefully weighed, most securely founded. Still, possibility of deception does not displace a fact. The existence of counterfeit money may be an inevitable outcome of our financial system; indeed, the counterfeit may exist in large amount. Yet this does not prove the non-existence of the genuine article. The very upcoming of the counterfeit depends upon the valid reality of the genuine. However multitudinous the claims of the pseudo-miraculous, the valid reality of the veritable miracle abides, abides undispossessed.

Furthermore, we recognize the miracle not as merely supernatural, but as definitized working of a perfect God, a God who makes himself accessible to his children. Earthly parents heed requests of their little ones, proffer gifts as result of request. Surely the Heavenly parent is not less free and gracious than the earthly. Kant, contemplating religion on a purely rational basis, maintains that all men are inspired more or less. It was one of our science leaders (Tyndall) who declared that the Divine Presence affects him most when his mind is clearest. Indeed, man as rational develops under the

inspiration of prayer. In all lands, in all ages, men have appealed to the power that overrules. They have been satisfied that God hears and answers.

From the answering of prayer to the working of the miracle we pass on by indiscernible gradations. Indeed, the objection to the miracle is involved in our recognition of prayer. How far does God accomplish results in answer to man's petition? It is impossible to determine. While we declare all results traceable to uniform causation, we cannot exclude the possibility of higher laws, higher causes. To say God cannot, is to overlook the infinite facility of a perfect Ruler. It is to decide that the rational praying creature is deceived as to his reception of Divine guidance and gifts. It is to assume that our knowledge of the world does not permit the development of higher harmonies. It is to disparage the glory of an unlimited God.

And the miracle is but the further proceeding of inscrutable wisdom. The ongoing of nature we have not fully interpreted.¹ To Huxley the cosmic field presented miracles on every hand. There indeed the silent miracle may go on from hour to hour. God is not limited by our ignorance. His freedom to vary his universe is unbounded. We must inquire further, however, as to whether we can see a reason, a sufficient reason, for God's interference. What can we infer as to the

NECESSITY FOR THE MIRACULOUS?

As we have already noted, our greatest modern thinker maintains that men in perfect obedience see for themselves. Aristotle, however, had declared that no man reaches the perfection for which he is empowered. We find, furthermore, that lack of perfect obedience develops incapacity, even depri-

¹ See a suggestive article by Professor Greene, "The Relation of the Miracle to Nature," in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1906.

vation of vision. Indeed, the Greeks signally failed to interpret and realize the one Divine Being idealized and realized by Aristotle. Stoics and Epicureans represent a retrogression. The polytheistic pantheon, it is true, has vanished from Olympus, from sky, and earth and sea, but the one recognized reason that rules is, according to the Stoic, impersonal, certainly unpaternal; while the recognition of a future life has well nigh ceased to be.

As to general ethnic evolution, in ancient Egypt the intellection of one supreme Divine being everywhere existent and paternal did not reach full completeness. The emphasis on future life seemed to develop for a time, but on low range. In China, the impersonal reason was an unforgiving, all-powerful, far-away agency, the idea of existence in the future having evidently a minimum expansion. In India, the recognition of one personal supreme God was but dubiously evolved. The acme of individual immortality was *Nirvana*, the happy negation, the absorption of the personality in all-controlling essence. Even under the Judaic dispensation, if we acknowledge complete monotheism, the one God rules rather as a king than as a father, and the future life was claimed for the regimen, an eternal Jewish kingdom, rather than for the individual.

In the arena of philosophy we still see the inadequacy of the philosophic in the thought and life of men. At the zenith of development in the ancient world, Plato gives us immortality as ideal rather than real. His ideation failed to take possession of the psychic energies even of the Greeks. Similarly, in our modern time, Kant's well-known claim that the postulate of immortality resides irresistible in the human soul has commanded the admiring recognition of able thinkers, but has signally failed to inspire the working forces in practical life.

As to the field of science, modern science, science in the

light of evolution, have we here adequate solutions? If science says, God is unknowable, we will simply acknowledge that science has reached no final analysis of the eternal energy. A first cause is not determinable by man's finite measuring. As for the eternal energy, science is dubiously certain that man rises to fully fledged participation, personal immortality. Finally, mayhap science will be able to discover adequate evidences of man's evolution into such perfect and permanent regimen. Thus far, however, her limitations do not admit the all-sufficient proofs that can satisfy. While then we acknowledge progress, much progress, in the arena of science, we must as well acknowledge her failure to substantiate. God as a paternal sovereign, freedom as a fact verified by empirical discovery, immortality as outcome of science-intellection, remain still among the veiled mysteries which our modern evolutionism is striving to resolve.

In the meantime, a freedom which is perfectly safe and saving, freedom indeed; a God who is love and truth, ready to rescue where freedom has dethroned itself; and an immortal life in which man reaches the ultimatum of perfect development, free divine sonship,—these we must still reach and verify elsewhere. Man in his freedom and longings and failures requires light. His independence may become self-destructive. Light for a struggling world is demanded. If there is any such realization as perfect peace, man needs intelligence from beyond the fields of science. Has such miraculous verification been supplied?

HISTORICAL VALIDATION.

The ethnic religions evidently failed to satisfy the demands of advancing civilization. They failed to develop a life of the highest order, a life able to maintain itself in a solidarity of the

free and the Good. With the collapse of the Greek and Roman civilization came a leader who announced that peace and goodwill were still possible on earth. At the same time, while a kingship of righteousness is to dominate from sea to sea, he declares that his "Kingdom is not of this world." He preaches glad tidings, saying, Blessed, Blessed, proclaiming the highest and the truest freedom, that a God of infinite love offers salvation to blind, lost men, and that an eternal life is an absolute reality. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father"; "Because I live, ye shall live also"; "I am the light of the world." He evidently speaks with authority. God is "manifest in the flesh." How did Christ verify his claims? By his wondrous works he made adequate proof of his divine mission. By miracles he established his teaching. A ruler of the Jews echoed the general conviction,¹ No man can perform these miracles "except God be with him." "The Word was God." The miracles were sufficiently numerous, were unmistakably public, and representative of Divine beneficence. Fatherhood of God and sonship of men are declared and, as far as possible, substantiated. Eternal life, conquering the grave, is sufficiently proven by the miraculous rising of the Divine teacher.

Now what can be said of the validity of these claims and proofs? Of course, there were those who doubted, who rejected at the time. The Christ was crucified. This, however, only gave best opportunity to demonstrate his triumph, triumph over death. We have written testimony of impartial witnesses. The records have been subjected to criticism, to destructive criticism. But clearly the constructive critics are able to hold the field.² Hume in the name of empirical phi-

¹ John III. 2.

² See articles by a famous critical authority in archæology, Dr. Emil Reich, on the Bankruptcy of the Higher Criticism, in the *Contemporary Review* for 1905 and 1906.

losophy has pronounced the miracle unprovable. If we depend on empirical investigation alone, as we have seen, Hume is correct. Validation does not come through ordinary experiment. It has been claimed by Strauss and Renan that the supernatural in Christianity can be accounted for as delusion, on a merely mythical basis. Strauss, however, failed to convince the solid thinkers of Germany.¹ He did succeed in dividing the Hegelian school, the most noted school of philosophy in modern times. The Left Wing, following Strauss, declares the very idea of a miracle irrational. The Right Wing, however, is not prepared to set aside the miraculous on *a priori* grounds. They find the historic proofs as satisfactory as the accepted proofs that verify history in general,² and recognize no valid reason for regarding these verities as insubstantial.

But preëminently do we find valid evidence of Christ's infallible teaching in the evolution of modern civilization, Christian civilization. The truth is making men truly free. The precepts of the cross-bearing Christ, the risen Christ, have become the leaven of the most enlightened nations. Love, self-sacrifice, righteousness, are giving increasing power to those who lead. The dawn of the kingship of the heavenly becomes unmistakable. The Prince of peace is taking the throne. His followers bring hope and joy to a needy world. The old civilizations, the old religions, fail as they compete. By their fruits they are known. In the words of Professor Wright, who is a thoroughly critical scholar in both science and religion: "The historical proof of Christianity rests upon a much firmer basis than can be found underneath the great

¹ See his expression of deep disappointment in his later volume, *The Old Faith and the New*.

² Dorner, *Christology*.

mass of beliefs which inspire and direct the general activities of the human race. To abandon, for hypercritical reasons, our belief in the main correctness of the original documents of Christianity which have come down to us from the first century is to cut loose from the line of historical progress, and unnecessarily doom ourselves to spiritual death by a slow process of mental starvation.”¹

FINAL EVIDENCE.

Our latest science is far from being purely negative in regard to what is beyond its limits. Many men of science are larger, greater, than science. They recognize with reverence what overpasses discovery. Their logic involves axioms of universal validity. Even would-be agnosticism, which proclaims the unknowable, is truly though unconsciously agnostic as to its assumption to know, to know absolutely, the limits of man's intellection. In the evolution of religion, man, approaching the zenith of his development, becomes increasingly rational and realistic in his interpretation of transcendent facts. His theistic ideas attain validation more and more.² The higher felicity which could revel as it would “mingle with the universe” (Byron) becomes highest felicity as man finds that he may become one with the Ruler of the universe.

Man, in the arena of science, worships and serves none the less devoutly and fervently because he appreciates that an infinite God cannot be absolutely interpreted. Indeed, even common finite objects are not knowable perfectly. If man cannot know perfectly, he may recognize sufficiently, glorying in his progress as he reaches the unspeakably adorable source of his

¹ G. Frederick Wright, *Scientific Aspects of Christian Evidences*, page 350.

² For a discussion of moral freedom under divine law, see *Religion and Science*, by Joseph Le Conte, page 292.

being. He thus determines for himself increasingly the spiritual realities that are evolved for his higher vision, and which are not attained by the vision of the undeveloped underling. Man's godlike possibilities thus emerge into consciousness. Sonship with the Divine, partnership with the eternal, sovereignty evolving through service,—these are the potencies which verify themselves as man rises to the attainments of an unlimited progression. By participation in highest things, spiritual discerning, men realize, actualize, the words of the Nazarene, "Ye shall know the truth." Yes, the evidences of immortality develop in consciousness more and more. The clearest, finest minds become most appreciative of conscious unity with the everlasting Father. Christ's teachings, his claims, his miraculous works, have all the verification that is required.

ARTICLE XI.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

HISTORY OF BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA. By HUGO WINCKLER, Ph.D., Professor in the University of Berlin. Translated and Edited by JAMES ALEXANDER CRAIG, Ph.D., Professor of Semitic Languages and Literatures in the University of Michigan. Revised by the Author. 8vo. Pp. xii, 352. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.50, *net*.

No better authority than Professor Winckler could be found to write the History of Babylonia and Assyria, nor any more faithful translator than Dr. Craig, who adds many illuminating notes from his own minute knowledge of the subject. The ordinary reader will be surprised to see how much material for history has been furnished by the recent explorations of the monuments of Babylonia. It now seems clear that the earliest occupants of Babylonia were not Semites, but Sumerians. The Sumerians (i.e. inhabitants of Shinar) spoke an agglutinative language, and were the inventors of the cuneiform script. The Semites were immigrants from Eastern Arabia, who came in successive waves, entering the lower part of Babylonia and moving northward to Mesopotamia, finding, as they went, a highly developed civilization.

The earliest fixed date, that of Sargon I. (who ruled at Accad, a little north of Babylon) has been generally supposed to be 3800 B.C., but Dr. Winckler brings it down to 3000 B.C. Dr. Craig, however, in a note, contends, and we think properly, for the earlier date.

There seem to have been four main Semitic migrations northward, the first of which, upon our author's calculations, occurred about 3400 B.C., and was limited to the lower part of the valley, being contemporaneous with the North Babylonian kingdom, of which Sargon I. and Naram-Sin are the best known kings. The second incursion (about one thousand

years later) was contemporaneous with a movement that our author describes as Canaanite, in which the rule was transferred to Babylon. This immigration reached Assyria and Palestine, and probably Egypt, at the time of the Hyksos incursions. It extended from 2400 B.C. to about 2000 B.C. An Aramaic or Chaldean immigration followed during several succeeding centuries, covering a period from Abraham to the Exodus.

Chapter XIV. is an interesting discussion of the original state of the land, of irrigation, the arts, religion and science, commerce, business, and industry. It is noticeable that the earliest art was the best:—

“The monumental art of Sargon and Gudea, figures so dimly visible through the haze of antiquity, exhibit achievements of classic excellence when placed by the side of the work of the artists of the first dynasty. Babylonian rule and intercourse were never so widely extended as then, and the general intellectual measure as well as the artistic products of this second epoch are markedly inferior. This second Semitic invasion of Babylonia resulted in deterioration in the highest elements and evidences of national progress, notwithstanding the material and political improvements made, especially during the reign of Khammurabi” (p. 63).

A remarkably full index fitly completes a volume which every student of the Bible and of Oriental history will find it profitable to possess.

THE EARLY TRADITIONS OF GENESIS. By ALEX. R. GORDON, D.Litt., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis, Presbyterian College, Montreal. 8vo. Pp. xii, 348. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, Imported.

This volume deals with only the first eleven chapters of Genesis. In the first part there are ten chapters discussing questions of the “Age and Relation of the Documents,” “The Sources of the Traditions,” the employment of “Myth and Legend,” “Israel's Conception of God,” “The Cosmogonies,” “The Nature and Destiny of Men,” and various other topics. An appendix gives an original translation of the documents, and furnishes critical and exegetical notes. To this are added translations from various Babylonian records. The volume

belongs to that numerous class now issuing from the press in which the analysis of the divisive critics is accepted without question, while at the same time an effort is made to retain a high place for the literature as an instrument for conveying spiritual truth. Upon the question of Israel's conception of God, emphasis is laid upon the fact that "the most notable feature in the Hebrew myths is the universal assumption of the *unity* of God" (p. 98). At the same time the author concedes that in the "original Israelitic tradition, Jahveh is not necessarily the only God" (p. 101). His first proof of this illustrates the tendency of his school of interpreters to draw out of passages a great deal that is not in them. For example, he says that, in ix. 26 f., "Jahveh is the God of Shem=Israel, but not also of Japheth, the ally and friend of Shem" (p. 101). All the basis for this inference is in the verse which reads, "Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem; and let Canaan be his servant. God enlarge Japheth and let him dwell in the tents of Shem." But surely when Kipling sings, "God of our fathers, known of old," it would be unfair to attribute to him the belief that He was not also the God of other nations than the English. This genitive is not designed to limit the range of the Deity's dominion, but merely to emphasize the relationship. The qualifying phrase is one of *specification*, rather than of *limitation*; and so of all the other cases adduced by the author.

COUTUMES DES ARABES AU PAYS DE MOAB. Par LE P. ANTONIN JAUSSEN, des Frères Prêcheurs. Pp. xii, 440. Nine Plates. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, J. Gabalda & Cie. 1908.

This book is one of the series of *Études bibliques*, a preceding volume of which was noticed in the April number of the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, the series which is being issued by the able scholars who form the Faculty of the École Pratique d'Études Bibliques de Jerusalem. Père Jausсен, the author of this book, is Professor of Arabic in this school, and is a past master of the language. In the volume before us he has given us a masterly study of the customs of the Arabs of the country of ancient Moab. These Arabs lie just on the border

land between the desert where the Bedu roam and the more settled regions where the Fellahin are settled. It is the region where the former are passing over into the latter. It is an admirable region in which to trace the survival of hoary Semitic customs.

Père Jaussen devotes his first chapter to the family. After a description of families in general, he treats woman, marriage and divorce, foods, dwellings, good works, hospitality, the wearing of the hair, and death and burials. Chapter II. is devoted to the tribe, and treats of the organization of the tribe and of the Sheik. Chapter III. takes up the relations of the tribes, and treats of alliances of cousinship and brotherhood—i.e. of different degrees of obligation—of raids for plunder, and of war. Chapter IV. treats of jurisprudence. In it are described their judges, judicial procedure, witnesses, bail or security, the laws of guardians or administrators, the laws of the tent, the laws of honor, of host and guest, of protégés, of revenge and punishment, and of fugitives. Chapter V. is devoted to their economic life, and treats of property, agriculture, trade, the horse, the camel, small animals, dogs, journeymen, hunting, and serpents. Chapter VI. treats of the religion, and describes their conceptions of Allah, of Welys, of ancestors, jinns, *'umyn el gheit* (a kind of rain spirit) sacred trees, sacred stones, their various sacrifices, circumcision, offering of first fruits, vows, holy seasons, superstitions, and fakirs. Four appendices follow. Appendix A gives a list of the tribes of Moab; Appendix B, the tribes of the Negeb; Appendix C treats of the migration from Nineveh of the 'Azeizat, a Christian tribe who now live at Madaba; and Appendix D gives a sketch of Ibrahim at-Tual, a Christian Arab of Madaba. The plates contain fifteen excellent half-tone reproductions of photographs which illustrate the customs described. Some of these represent things which have, so far as I know, never before been pictured to a Western scholar. A map of Moab concludes the work. Such a book by a hand so competent is a great accession to our material. It is filled with first-hand information which appeals to the economist, the sociologist, the

student of the Bible, the student of Mohammedanism, and the student of comparative religion. Père Jaussen's book will take its place by the side of Doughty's "Arabia Deserta" as a reliable source of information of prime importance concerning things Arabian and Semitic.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

THE BABYLONIAN EXPEDITION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA. Series A: Cuneiform Texts. Edited by H. V. Hilprecht. Vol. VIII. Part I.—LEGAL AND COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS, Dated in the Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and Persian Periods, chiefly from Nippur. By ALBERT T. CLAY, Assistant Professor of Semitic Philology and Archaeology, University of Pennsylvania. Seventy-two Plates of Autograph Texts. Nine Plates of Halftone Reproductions, Pp. 85. Philadelphia: Department of Archaeology, University of Pennsylvania.

The bulk of this volume consists of beautifully executed plates of seals and inscriptions from which students can read the records as readily as from the original documents. Another important part of the volume contains a concordance of proper names. Thirty-one translations of selected texts are given. These relate to ejectments to recover the possession of houses, contracts relating to rents, the possession of slaves as security for debts, relating to the custody of a temple, for the protection of a storehouse gate, for the sale of a date-palm plantation, for five years' hire of a flock of sheep and goats, etc. A promissory note bearing twenty per cent interest and requiring an additional pledge of security is among the curiosities of this interesting collection. Another, dated in the first year of Darius, gives in full the assets of the temple of Ellil, which had been deposited in the environment of Nippur. The preliminary discussion gives the necessary information required for understanding the tablets. The presence of thumbnail marks, which were made instead of seal impressions, suggests the method of identification so recently invented by Bertillon. To make these marks it was necessary

to trim the nail in a very peculiar manner, and to rotate the thumb very carefully. "The uniformity and care with which these have been made clearly indicate that they are not the work of an inexperienced contractor, but of the scribe who wrote the document" (p. 3).

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. By AUGUSTUS HOPKINS STRONG, D.D. In Three Volumes. Vol. II.—THE DOCTRINE OF MAN. 8vo. Pp. xii, 406 (370–776). Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. \$2.50, *net*.

This volume amply sustains the reputation of the first (noticed in our Number for October, 1907). The author's views upon the interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis are admirable and characteristic:—

"We adopt neither (a) the allegorical, or mythical, (b) the hyper-literal, nor (c) the hyperscientific interpretation of the Mosaic narrative; but rather (d) the pictorial-summary interpretation,—which holds that the account is a rough sketch of the history of creation, true in all its essential features, but presented in a graphic form suited to the common mind and to earlier as well as to later ages. While conveying to primitive man as accurate an idea of God's work as man was able to comprehend, the revelation was yet given in pregnant language, so that it could expand to all the ascertained results of subsequent physical research" (pp. 393–394).

Among the subjects treated are: "Creation," "Preservation," "Providence," "The Original State of Man," "Sin, or Man's State of Apostasy," "The Consequences of Sin to Adam's Posterity," and the various topics connected with the Doctrine of Salvation through the Work of Christ and of the Holy Spirit. The supreme value of the work is found in the abundant selection of quotations from writers of all phases of belief, with references to the books and magazine articles in which they are found. In this respect the book has no rival. It is a liberal education in itself to peruse its closely packed pages. In the main, no candid reader can fail, also, to agree with the author in his statements of doctrines; and where disagreeing he will find his own positions fully stated.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By PHILIP SCHAFF. Volume V. Part I. THE MIDDLE AGES. By DAVID S. SCHAFF, D.D., Professor of Church History in the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa. 8vo. Pp. xiv, 910. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$3.25, *net*.

It was the original plan of Dr. Philip Schaff to complete the History of the Middle Ages in a single volume, but his son, who has taken up his work, has wisely chosen to devote two volumes to the period extending from Gregory VII. (1049) to the Reformation. After much delay incident to the preparation of so large a work, involving extensive acquaintance with mediæval writings, the first of these volumes is now before us, and the second, covering the ground from Boniface VIII. (1294) to the Reformation, is said to be in an advanced stage of preparation. The author is successful in carrying out his father's plans in a spirit of toleration and with a minuteness and breadth of scholarship which give confidence to all his statements of fact. The style is clear and graphic, and the literary references are abundant. When completed, the Series will have no equal in the English language.

A HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH since the Reformation. By S. CHEETHAM, D.D., Archdeacon and Canon of Rochester; Honorary Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge; Fellow and Emeritus Professor of King's College, London. 8vo. Pp. xii, 474. London: Macmillan and Co. \$2.60, *net*.

In the Preface the author says: "My History of the Early Church, Archdeacon Hardwick's Histories of the Middle Age and of the Reformation, together with that of the Modern Period now published, form a complete History of the Christian Church, on a small scale indeed, but written with constant reference to original authorities, and including, it is hoped, all the more important events and movements which have made the Church what it now is."

The work is brought strictly up to date, and is furnished with a full table of contents and an index, and in every

respect amply meets the expectations raised by the author's great reputation.

THE CITIES OF ST. PAUL: Their Influence on his Life and Thought. By W. M. RAMSAY, Kt., Hon. D. C. L., etc., Professor of Humanity in the University of Aberdeen. 8vo. Pp. xv, 452. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son. \$3.00, *net*.

The development of Professor Ramsay's views resulting from his painstaking study of the successive civilizations of Asia Minor is a significant and hopeful sign of the times. Beginning as a follower of Robertson Smith, who advocated a thoroughgoing theory of evolution as applied to religious history, he has become through his studies an ardent advocate of the opposite theory, formulated by St. Paul in the first chapter of Romans. In a masterly introductory chapter of eighty pages, he shows that degeneration has characterized the histories of all the nations around the Mediterranean in every department of effort. The ancient architecture, the ancient literature, the ancient agriculture, and the ancient governments were superior to what succeeded them in later times. The cause of this degeneracy lay in a deterioration of the moral nature. In the present sumptuous volume this theme is illustrated by a detailed history of the cities in Asia Minor made famous by the labors of the Apostle Paul,—Tarsus, Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra. Numerous maps, cuts, and photographic reproductions give interest to the work.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO S. MATTHEW. (The International Critical Commentary.) By WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M. A., Chaplain-Fellow, and Lecturer in Theology and Hebrew, Exeter College, Oxford Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Lichfield. 8vo. Pp. xcvi, 338. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$3.00, *net*.

In this volume the author has avoided the evils besetting many commentaries arising from lack of perspective, and has given us a work which, while showing abundant evidence of

Vol. LXV. No. 259. 13

scholarship on every page, is still specially adapted to the wants of the average student. The standpoint of the author is that of one who believes the synoptic Gospels to be "historical sources for Christ's life of nearly equal value," and which in large measure bring the reader into "immediate touch with the acts and words of the historical Christ" (p. iv). Mark is regarded as the original Gospel, which has been taken over by Matthew almost bodily, and Matthew is believed to have been put into its present form either a little before or just after the destruction of Jerusalem. Ample indexes add to the ease with which the abundant information compressed into the volume can be made available.

A DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, D.D. With the Assistance of JOHN A. SELBIE, D.D., and (in the reading of the proofs) of JOHN C. LAMBERT, D.D. Vol. II. LABOUR-ZION, with Appendix and Indexes. 8vo. Pp. xiv, 912. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1908. Sold only by Subscription. \$6.00 per volume.

More than two hundred authors contribute to this concluding volume. The selection of writers has been made from a wide range both of territory and of schools of thought, extending from Aberdeen, Scotland, to Waco, Texas,—and the scholarship of America is not inferior to that of Great Britain. The articles are thus fairly representative of the views entertained at the present time. None of them, however, are prepared by extremely liberal or destructive critics, and much judgment has been displayed in giving neutral topics to those who might be in danger of erring through lack of reverence. One is surprised, also, at the ingenuity displayed in the invention of topics bearing upon the main theme. Yet we cannot say that any of them are out of place. We find articles on "Loneliness," "Manliness," "Mental Characteristics," "Organization," "Personality," "Premeditation," "Readiness," "Self-assertion," "Simplicity," "Womanliness," and many other topics indirectly connected with the subject. Special fullness is given to the various Gospels, to "Miracles,"

"Miraculous Conception," "Messiah," "Person of Christ," "Paul," "Peter," "Quotations," "Sacrifice," "Sin," "Son of God," "Son of Man," "Universalism," not to mention many other articles long enough to be considered treatises in themselves. An appendix gives a connected account of Christ as he is recognized in the various periods of church history, and an elaborate article by Dr. Sanday on St. Paul.

Nearly all the writers adopt, with a positiveness not altogether warranted by the facts, the theory that Mark's is the original Gospel; while the date of Matthew's Gospel is dogmatically placed subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem, and that in face of the fact that the Gospel does not contain a single incidental intimation that the writer was familiar with the conditions following that epoch-making event. Still this volume, like the one preceding, will become almost a necessity to every well-equipped library. The literary references are abundant and up to date, albeit not always recognizing conservative authors so fully as they might. The printing and presswork are of the highest order, and the amount of material compressed into the volume is marvelous.

THE DATED EVENTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By WILLIS JUDSON BEECHER, D.D. 8vo. Pp. 202. Philadelphia: The Sunday School Times Company. \$1.50, *net*.

The main part of this work consists of tables showing in parallel columns the ascertained dates of Jewish history and the corresponding dates of foreign events. The tables begin with Abraham's first year in Canaan, which is fixed at 1928 B.C. The tables are accompanied by a running commentary explaining difficulties and giving the authorities upon which his conclusions are based. Important preliminary chapters treat of the "Chronological Data in the Old Testament," "External Data for Old Testament Chronology," "Chronological Units and Methods," and "Limits and Value of Bible Chronology."

The work practically solves every difficulty in Old Testament chronology, and the arrangement of material is such as to meet all the demands of convenience.

BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS; or, Interbiblical History. By the Rev. DAVID GREGG, D.D., LL.D., Sometime Pastor of Park Street Church, Boston, and Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn; now President of Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa. 12mo. Pp. 124. New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Company. 75 cents, *net*.

Dr. Gregg has done good service in publishing these popular lectures upon a neglected period of sacred history. Protestants suffer a great loss in their neglect of the Old Testament Apocrypha and the history of the stirring events of the Macabean age. The perusal of this volume will go far to supply the deficiency.

LIFE AND LIGHT: Thoughts from the Writings of George Dana Boardman. With Memorabilia. 8vo. Pp. x, 227. Philadelphia: The Griffith and Rowland Press. \$1.00, *net*.

An admirable selection from the writings of one of the most inspiring, spiritual, and catholic preachers of the generation that is just passing off the stage.

POSITIVE PREACHING AND MODERN MIND. By P. T. FORSYTH, M.A., D.D. The Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching, Yale University, 1907. 8vo. Pp. xii, 374. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. \$1.75, *net*.

The lecture form has been strictly adhered to in presenting this volume to the general public, though each lecture is much fuller than that given in oral delivery, and in many cases valuable appendices have been added. Students, also, rather than average readers, have been kept in view. The author has obtained a justly wide reputation for the emphasis which he gives in his preaching to the vicarious character of the death of Christ. One reads with satisfaction such words as the following:—

"Any conception of God which exalts His Fatherhood at the cost of His holiness, or to its neglect, unsettles the moral throne of the universe. Any reaction of ours from a too exacting God which leaves

us with but a kindly God, a patient and a pitiful, is a reaction which sends us over the edge of the moral world. And it robs us of moral energy. The fatherly God of recent religious liberalism is indeed a conception for which we have to bless Him when we look back on much that went before. But the gain brings loss. It is a conception which by itself tends to do less than justice even to God's love. It tends to take the authority out of the Gospel, the sinew out of preaching, the insight out of faith, the stamina out of character, and discipline out of the home" (p. 354).

"To lay the stress of Christ's revelation elsewhere than on the atoning Cross is to make Him no more than a martyr, whose testimony was not given by His death, but only sealed by it" (p. 357).

WHAT SHALL I BELIEVE? Addresses by the Faculty of the Auburn Theological Seminary. 12mo. Pp. xii, 220. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work.

An admirable series of addresses by the professors of one of the most important Presbyterian theological seminaries. We are specially pleased with Professor Dulles' contention that faith is not blind, but rests on evidence; while Professor Beecher shows by his essay "Concerning God" that he is as much at home in theology as in Old Testament literature.

THE CHRIST THAT IS TO BE. By the Author of "Pro Christo et Ecclesia." 8vo. Pp. xvii, 385. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.50, *net*.

The volume was published in Great Britain under the title "Christus Futurus." It is not regarded by the author as a finished work, but as a "series of successive efforts to think what the gospel of Jesus really is." Among the topics discussed are: "Our Need of Reformation," "The Doctrine of Prayer," "The Conflict of the Physical and the Moral," "The Use of Sin and of Pain," "Mind and Disease," "Faith and the Doctors," "The Nature Marvels," "Fasting and Temptation," and the Power of Christ's Death. The stimulating character of the discussions amply justifies their republication.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PERSONALITY OF CHRIST FOR THE MINISTER OF TO-DAY. Three addresses. By Rev. ERNEST G. GUTHRIE, Rev. PERCY H. EPLER, Rev. WILLARD B. THORP, D.D. 12mo. Pp. xi, 91. Boston: New York, Chicago: The Pilgrim Press. 75 cents, *net*.

These addresses by active pastors reveal the necessity for constructive theology in the practical work of the ministry. They are all stimulating and helpful, and treat in an admirable manner of the significance of the personality of Christ for the "Personal Religious Life of the Preacher," for the "Preacher's Theology," and for the "Minister's Preaching."

HISTORY OF ANCIENT CIVILIZATION. By CHARLES SEIGNOBOS. Translated and Edited by ARTHUR HERBERT WILDE. 8vo. Pp. xv, 373. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.25, *net*.

The standard history is characterized by great brevity and clearness of statement, in which specific literary references are entirely absent from the original, but there is an appendix giving a full bibliography, while the translator has from time to time added brief notes and literary references which would correct or supplement the statement in the main body of the work. On the whole, the volume is a most excellent, readable, and trustworthy summary of all that is definitely known concerning the ancient civilizations of the world.

THE INQUISITION IN THE SPANISH DEPENDENCIES,—Sicily, Naples, Sardinia, Milan, the Canaries, Mexico, Peru, New Granada. By HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL.D., S.T.D. 8vo. Pp. xvi, 564. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50, *net*.

The marvelous industry of the author receives fresh illustration in this sumptuous volume, which contains all the merits which we have commended in his previous works on the Inquisition (October, 1906: July, 1907), and easily places him "at the head of all the American historical students now living." The Inquisition in the Spanish Dependencies pursued faithfully the course followed in Spain itself, with results

equally deplorable. The Jews or Judaizers were special objects of its persecution, and Protestantism was a bugbear the fear of which stimulated the inquisitors to frantic activity. As a portion of a government system, its influence was potent "in contributing to the failure of Spanish colonial policy, by preventing orderly and settled administration, and by exciting disaffection which at length led to the loss of Spain's transatlantic empire." A perusal of the volume will give the reader a new sense of the important history that has been transacted in the Spanish colonies, and of the strangeness of a civilization alien in so many respects from that of Protestant nations.

A HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS PEOPLE from their Earliest Records to the Present Time. By ELROY MCKENDREE AVERY. In Fifteen Volumes. Vol. IV. 8vo. Pp. xxviii, 397. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company.

This volume carries on the history from the taking of Louisburg (in 1745) to the close of the Pontiac War (in 1764), and is characterized by all the excellences which we have commended in the preceding volumes. The narrative is straightforward and condensed, but perfectly luminous. The details are subordinated to their proper relations to the entire work. Original maps and illustrations appear on almost every page, and the printing and binding are above criticism. When the work is completed there will be nothing to compare with it.

ROMAN CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY. By JOHN E. GRANRUD, Professor in the University of Minnesota. 12mo. Pp. 284. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. \$1.25, post-paid.

No more timely or instructive book than this little volume has been published in recent years. The author traces the constitutional development of the Roman state from the earliest times to the beginnings of the empire under Julius Cæsar. The causes which led to each successive change are clearly stated, and in spite of the condensed form of the work the reader follows the shifting scene almost as distinctly as though it were actually pictured before him. The greed and the grafting propensities of the rich, the struggles of the poor,

the wrongs of the allies, the errors of the nobles, the mistakes of the leaders, the partial reforms of patriotic officials, the relentless cruelty of the demagogues, and many other features of Roman life are made to appear in their true setting as a part of the progress or retrogression of the eternal city, and no American citizen of the present time should fail to read this narrative of an early republic and its downfall. No thoughtful person can fail to receive much that is helpful and suggestive from a perusal of these pages whatever his occupation may be, and they should be especially instructive to all who are teachers or leaders of any sort. Our own republic is beginning to show signs of a decay similar to that which finally overtook and destroyed this one, and books like Granrud's should meet with a hearty welcome by all who love this country.

Cambridge, Mass.

H. W. MAGOUN.

THE INWARD LIGHT. By H. FIELDING HALL, author of "The Soul of a People," etc. 8vo. Pp. 228. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.75, *net*.

Under the guise of a story representing the experience of a Christian who, as the result of a painful accident, came to be an inmate of a Buddhist monastery, where he was cared for by the monks and inducted into the mysteries of Buddhism, our author gives a very complete and satisfactory account of the system. The story is interesting, and in the dialogues the reader will get a fairly correct view of the tenets of this marvelous faith. But we cannot agree with the author that "there is not in the Christianity of Christ very real difference from the teachings of Buddhism" (p. 220).

Among the most welcome of our English Exchanges is the *Churchman*, edited by W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. The Editor's moderate and sane discussions upon the educational and temperance bills now before Parliament are especially to be commended, as is the series of articles, by P. J. Heawood, M. A., entitled "A Layman's Thoughts on Old Testament Criticism." It is worthy of note, also, that it was through this magazine that our own valued contributor, Harold Wiener, Esq., was first introduced to the general public.

THE RECORDS OF THE PAST

PARTIAL CONTENTS—Volume VI., 1907.

- Climate and History in Western Asia (5 Illustrations). By E. Cutler Shedd.
- Development of the System of Boundary Fortifications in Britain and Germany under the Roman Empire. By George H. Allen.
- Troglodyte Dwellings of Bakhtchi-Sarai (11 Illustrations). By G. Frederick Wright.
- The McEvers Mounds, Pike County, Ill. (2 Illustrations). By Clara K. Bayliss.
- The Nebraska Loess Man (5 Illustrations). By Robert F. Gilder.
- Ancient Inhabitants of Nebraska (5 Illustrations). By Erwin H. Barbour.
- Roman North Africa (8 Illustrations). By C. Densmore Curtis.
- Prehistoric Man in Nebraska. By E. E. Blackman.
- Mound Builders of the Mississippi Valley (7 Illustrations). By Richard Herrmann.
- Palestine Exploration Fund. By Theodore F. Wright.
- A Primitive Cattle Shrine in Asia Minor (3 Illustrations). By George E. White.
- Nehawka Flint Quarries (6 Illustrations). By E. E. Blackman.
- The Autobiographic Element in Latin Literature and Inscriptions (5 Illustrations). By Henry H. Armstrong.
- Site of Ancient Persepolis (4 Illustrations). By Thomas F. Nelson.
- Preserving Wisconsin Mounds (2 Illustrations). By Frank A. Flower.
- Pre-Indian Inhabitants of North America (16 Illustrations). By Newton H. Winchell.
- Work of the Ohio Archæological Society.
- Ancient Pottery Furnaces. By Frank A. Flower.
- Lead Furnaces. By W. M. F. Petrie.
- Soul-Houses in Egypt (8 Illustrations). By W. M. F. Petrie.
- Relics of the Stone Age from Taltal, Chile.
- Archæological Work of the University of California. By A. L. Kroeber.
- Amber in Asia.
- The Evolution of the Greek Fret (8 Illustrations). By Eunice G. Allyn.
- Greek Draped Figure at Vassar (6 Illustrations). By Edmund von Mach.
- Maya Ruins in Quintana Roo. By Count Maurice de Perigny.
- The Swastika. By Charles De W. Brower.
- The Hittite Capital, Boghaz-keuy and its Environs (12 Illustrations). By George E. White.
- New Light on Babylonian Chronology.
- The Rock of Cashel (4 Illustrations). By St. John Seymour.
- Interdependent Evolution of Oases and Civilizations.
- Egyptian Research Account.
- An Archæological Tour through Sicily with a Camera (22 Illustrations). By Edward W. Clark.
- The Beginnings of Iron.
- A Palæolithic Implement from the Loess (2 Illustrations). By Luella A. Owen.
- Roman Portrait Head in Vassar College (6 Illustrations). By Edmund von Mach.
- The Liver in Babylonian Divination (5 Illustrations). By Albert T. Clay.
- Adolf Furtwangler. By Edmund von Mach.
- Huntington's "Explorations in Central Asia" (5 Illustrations). By Frederick Bennett Wright.

Noteworthy Series of Articles in Late Numbers of the Bibliotheca Sacra

I. The Diseases of the Bible

By EDWARD M. MERRINS, M. D.

- Biblical Epidemics of Bubonic Plague (April, 1904).
- Deaths of Antiochus IV., Herod the Great, and Herod Agrippa I. (July, 1904).
- The Malady of Saul, King of Israel (October, 1904).
- Did Jesus Die of a Broken Heart (January and April, 1905).
- The Abasement of Nebuchadnezzar (October, 1905).
- The Powers of Darkness (April and July, 1906).
- The Patience of Job (April, 1907).
- St. Paul's Thorn in the Flesh (October, 1907).
- The Plagues of Egypt (July and October, 1908).

II. The Latest Translation of the Bible

By HENRY M. WHITNEY.

- Problems and Difficulties (April, 1902).
- Aims and Results (July, 1902).
- From Another Standpoint (October, 1902).
- Supplementary (January, 1903).
- The Question of Modernness in the Light of Two Recent Examples (April, 1903).
- Additional Points—Chiefly as to Rhetorical Method (April, 1904).
- Concerning Certain Other Versions, more or less in the Modern (January, 1905).
- A Few Final Tests (April, 1905).
- Concerning Idiom (July, 1907).

III. A Jew's Unanswerable Defense of the Orthodox View of the Pentateuch

HAROLD M. WIENER, Esq.

- Some Fatal Weaknesses of the Wellhausen School (January, 1907).
- Hebrew Monotheism (October, 1907).
- "Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents" (January, 1908).
- Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism (July and October, 1908).

Persons desiring these valuable papers can obtain them for 50 cents a number, or \$4.80 for First Series, \$3.60 for Second Series, and \$2.50 for Third Series; or \$10.50 for the years 1902-1908, inclusive.

Address,

Bibliotheca Sacra Co. OBERLIN, OHIO, U.S.A.

OFFER TO NEW SUBSCRIBERS: THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA FOR 1909
AND DR. WRIGHT'S "SCIENTIFIC CONFIRMATIONS OF OLD TESTAMENT
HISTORY," FOR \$3.25.

SEVENTY-EIGHTH YEAR.

OCT 7 1908

OCTOBER, 1908.

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly

EDITOR

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

ASSOCIATED WITH

FRANK H. FOSTER, D. W. SIMON, JAMES LINDSAY, HUGH M. SCOTT, CHARLES
F. THWING, NEWELL DWIGHT HILLIS, A. A. BERLE, WILLIAM
E. BARTON, WILLIAM EDWARDS PARK, HENRY A.
STIMSON, HERBERT W. MAGOUN.

CONTENTS

THE ALLEGED COLLAPSE OF NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY.	Editorial.	601
THE PLAGUES OF EGYPT (II.)	Edward M. Merrins.	611
RECOLLECTIONS OF LINCOLN.	J. O. Cunningham.	636
THE REAL DATE OF THE GOSPELS.	Parke P. Flournoy.	657
A REMARKABLE CLAIM ON BEHALF OF THE RADICAL CRITICISM.		
	William M. McPheeters.	679
CIRCUMCISION AMONG THE SAMARITANS.	Jacob, Son of Aaron.	694
REFLECTIONS IN ROME.	James Lindsay.	711
ESSAYS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM (II.)	Harold M. Wiener.	723
NOTES.		755
Justification by Faithfulness.	A. B. Curtis.	755
Ground of Authority in Religion.		759
The Sacrifice of Christ as a Ransom Paid to the Devil.	Henry A. Stimson.	761
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.		763
INDEX.		777

OBERLIN, OHIO, U. S. A.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

EUROPEAN AGENTS, CHARLES HIGHAM & SON, LONDON.

SINGLE NUMBER, 75 CENTS.

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.00.

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History

By G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

D.D., LL.D., F. G. S. A.

PRESS NOTICES.

"The appearance of Dr. Wright's book at the present juncture is extremely opportune. The battle of Higher Criticism has in great measure run on linguistic and historical lines, and if there be any reference to science in connection with the earlier books of the Bible it is as a rule a contemptuous brushing aside of the idea that Biblical science and latter-day science could possibly be in accord, as when in a recent book we read '[Genesis i.] is a veritable Old Man of the Sea to commentators.' Dr. Wright has travelled widely for the sake of exploration in both the Old and New World, and does not, like too many professors on this side of the Atlantic, reconstruct the scheme of the Bible from his study chair."—*The Record* (England).

"The title of this work is fully justified by its learned contents. No thoughtful mind—no sincere searcher for the truth—can give due consideration to the vast accumulation of scientific facts arranged by the author in this volume and fail to be confirmed in a belief of the accuracy of the historical statements of the Old Testament. It is a marvelous unfolding of the geological events of the post-Tertiary period, well calculated to incite the general reader to a closer study of its significant and overwhelming facts, which invite investigation on every hand. The discussion is also eminently worthy of the attention of geologists, many of whom, the author observes, are so engrossed in their particular studies that they have little leisure or inclination to consider the action of geological forces in their more general application. . . . We consider Dr. Wright's book a most valuable contribution to the literature of scientific Bible defence, and wish for it a very wide circulation."—*English Churchman*.

"The facts brought to light are of supreme interest, and may modify some of the conclusions of Old Testament criticism."—*British Congregationalist*.

"The most important part of the book is undoubtedly the extended treatment from chaps. vi. to xi. of the Biblical account of the Noachian Deluge in its relation to the facts of science. Here the author writes on a subject in relation to which he has first-hand knowledge and is an admitted expert, and the mass of facts he accumulates from all parts of the globe seem to prove beyond dispute the reality of a great catastrophe after or in connection with the close of the glacial period, which swept away the forms of life then existing, and made a complete break between older and newer man."—JAMES ORR, D.D., *Homiletic Review*.

"If the destructive critics and the skeptics who attack the Old Testament were only open to argument, this book would settle the question for them. . . . The last chapter is the best discussion of its subject we have seen. The whole book is strengthening and even inspiring. Whoever would be posted should get this admirable work."—Dr. T. T. EATON, *Western Recorder*.

"He is very happy in his style of telling us what he has seen, and why he interpreted it as he does, and what is the bearing of his work on the Bible. The volume bids fair to be recognized as the standard work on the important subject of Pentateuchal physics; just as explorations of the ruins of Chaldea, Assyria, and Egypt have enlightened us as to Old Testament historicity."—Dr. G. MACCLOSKEY, *Princeton Review*.

The Bibliotheca Sacra Company
OBERLIN, OHIO.

The Harvard Theological Review

AN UNDENOMINATIONAL QUARTERLY
EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY
IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Volume I.

OCTOBER, 1908.

Number 4

C O N T E N T S .

CALVIN'S PROGRAMME FOR A PURITAN STATE IN GENEVA, 1536-1541.

Herbert D. Foster

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION.....*James B. Pratt*

THE TASK OF THE SYSTEMATIC RELIGIOUS THINKER OF TO-DAY.

Daniel Evans

MONISM, PLURALISM, AND PERSONALISM.....*John W. Buckham*

THE MORAL CRISIS WITHIN THE CHURCH.....*Frank I. Paradise*

THE MEDIATORIAL OFFICE OF THE VEDIC FIRE GOD..*E. Washburn Hopkins*

STEVENSON AS AN INTERPRETER OF LIFE.....*James A. Geissinger*

SOME RECENT BOOKS ON THEOLOGY.....*William W. Fenn*

THE HARVARD EXCAVATIONS AT SAMARIA.

NEW YORK:

The Macmillan Company

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, PER YEAR, \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES50

The Review and Expositor

Faculty of the Southern
Baptist Theological
Seminary,
Louisville, Ky.,
Editors.

Contributors from all parts of the world.
Fifty pages of book reviews each issue.
Able and Progressive Articles.

PRICE \$2.00 A YEAR.

===== ADDRESS: =====

Review and Expositor

NORTON HALL

LOUISVILLE, KY.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIVE DOLLARS

Is what it would cost you to subscribe for the thirty or forty English quarterlies, monthly reviews and magazines, and literary and political weekly journals, which are drawn upon regularly for the weekly numbers of

The Living Age

But THE LIVING AGE sifts all this material for you, and gives you unchanged and unabridged, week by week, in an attractive form, all that is best worth reading in this long list of periodicals: essays; literary, art and musical criticism; travel and descriptive articles; poetry, fiction, and, best of all, the freshest discussions of INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND WORLD POLITICS by the most brilliant writers in England.

The fact that THE LIVING AGE has been published for more than 64 years without missing an issue and that it has no competitor in its field indicates that it does this service well.

THE LIVING AGE, containing 64 pages weekly, and presenting, in a year, as much material as two of the four-dollar magazines, will cost you only SIX DOLLARS A YEAR. Or, if you want to become acquainted with it before subscribing for a year, your name will be entered for a THREE MONTHS' TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION (13 numbers) for ONE DOLLAR. Specimen copy free on request.

New subscribers for 1909 will receive free the remaining numbers of 1908 from the date on which their subscriptions reach the publishers.

The Living Age Company

6 BEACON STREET

BOSTON, MASS.

THE HIBBERT JOURNAL

A Quarterly Review of Religion, Theology, and Philosophy.

The October number, which is now ready, begins the seventh volume, and is a remarkable issue both in the wide range and compelling interest of its unusual contents. The contributions range from Professor James, of Harvard, to the Solicitor-General of Ceylon; in religious belief, from a Jesuit priest to an ardent Unitarian; in subject, from a defence of Christianity to a Chinese statesman's view of religion, with a study of Hegel in between. The voluntary assertion, from more than one authoritative source, that THE HIBBERT is the greatest quarterly in the world, is surely well borne out by this number.

Principal Contents for October

THE MISCARRIAGE OF LIFE IN THE WEST.

By SRI RAMANATHAN, Solicitor-General of Ceylon.

A CHINESE STATESMAN'S VIEW OF RELIGION.

By CHARLES JOHNSON, late Bengal Civil Service.

THE MOSLEM TRADITION OF JESUS' SECOND VISIT ON EARTH.

By Captain F. W. VON HERBERT, author of the "Defence of Plevna."
HEGEL AND HIS METHOD.

By Professor WILLIAM JAMES, of Harvard.

A GREAT SOCIAL EXPERIMENT.

By Rev. CHARLES PLATER, S.J., a Jesuit Priest.

PAIN. By Miss CAROLINE E. STEPHEN, the sister of Sir LESLIE STEPHEN.

INFALLIBILITY AND TOLERATION.

By F. C. S. SCHILLER, the British Pragmatist.

THE "JERAHMEEL THEORY": A MISTAKEN NAME FOR A GENUINE THING. By Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, D.Litt., D.D., F.B.A.

With equally important articles by PROFESSOR M'GIFFERT, John Page Hopps, Hon. Bertrand Russell, Rev. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., and others.

DISCUSSIONS and BOOK REVIEWS.

\$2.50 Per Annum.

75 Cents Per Copy.

Subscriptions for the coming year should begin with this issue as the first of the seventh volume, but may commence with a back number if desired. Subscriptions can be filled immediately and single copies had by return mail by addressing the publishers.

Sherman, French & Company

6 BEACON STREET

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ETHICS

A Quarterly Devoted to the Advancement
of Ethical Knowledge and Practice.

This Journal, in its own distinct field, is the foremost quarterly of its kind published. It deals from the many points of view of its world-wide contributors with the fundamental principles and concepts of ethics and with the various phases of individual conduct and social morality on their practical side. The writers for THE JOURNAL are frequently of international fame, who treat their subjects with broad tolerance, wide knowledge, and just discrimination. In the Editorial Committee itself are represented seven different nationalities truly emphasizing the international range of thought and influence of THE JOURNAL, which thus stands for and gives expression to the best ethical thought of the world.

SOME LEADING ARTICLES FOR OCTOBER
(beginning the 19th volume)

- THE MORALS OF AN IMMORALIST—FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE.
By ALFRED W. BENN.
- SAVONAROLA.
By THOMAS DAVIDSON.
- THE DRAMATIC AND ETHICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF EXPERIENCE.
By Professor J. B. BAILLIE.
- THE MODERN CONCEPTION OF JUSTICE.
By F. MELIAN STAWELL.
- ETHICS AND LAW.
By Professor CHARLES W. SUPER.
- A NEW TYPE OF NATURALISM—MONTGOMERY.
By WILLIAM MACKINTIRE SALTER.

Yearly Subscriptions, \$2.50.

Single Numbers, - .65.

Subscriptions for the coming year should begin with this issue as the first of the nineteenth volume, but may commence with a back number if desired. Subscriptions can be filled immediately and single copies had by return mail by addressing the publishers.

Sherman, French & Company
6 Beacon Street, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Christianity of Today Series (Now Ready)

- GOD—AN ENQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF MAN'S HIGHEST IDEAL, AND A SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM FROM THE STANDPOINT OF SCIENCE,** by PAUL CARUS. 239 pp. Cloth. Gilt top. Price, \$1.00, net. (4s. 6d., net.)
- JESUS AND MODERN RELIGION,** by EDWIN A. RUMBALL. 160 pp. Boards. 75 cents, net. (3s. 6d., net.)
- WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT JESUS,** by CHARLES F. DOLE, D.D. 80 pp. Boards. 75 cents, net. (3s. 6d., net.)
- PARALIPOMENA—REMAINS OF GOSPELS AND SAYINGS OF CHRIST,** by BERNHARD PICK, Ph.D., D.D. 158 pp. Boards. 75 cents, net. (3s. 6d., net.)
- LIFE AND MINISTRY OF JESUS.** According to the Historical Method. Being a Course of Lectures by RUDOLPH OTTO, LIC. TH. Translated from the third unaltered edition by W. J. WHITBY, D.D. Boards. 50 cents, net. (2s. 6d., net.)

Religions Ancient and Modern

The Series is intended to present to a large public the salient features of the GREAT RELIGIONS of the Human Race. The Volumes already published have met with the most gratifying appreciation. Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, 40 cents net per volume.

NOW PUBLISHED

ANIMISM, by EDWARD CLODD.
PANTHEISM, by JAMES ALLANSON PICTON.
CELTIC RELIGION, by PROF. ANWYL.
MYTHOLOGY OF ANCIENT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, by CHARLES SQUIRE.
ANCIENT EGYPT, by PROF. W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE.
SCANDINAVIAN RELIGION, by W. A. CRAIGIE.
HINDUISM, by DR. L. D. BARNETT.
ANCIENT CHINA, by PROF. GILES.
THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT MEXICO AND PERU, by LEWIS SPENCE.

MAGIC AND FETISHISM, by DR. A. C. HADDON.
ANCIENT GREECE, by JANE HARRISON.
BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, by THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES.
ISLAM, by SYED AMEER ALI, M.A.
RELIGION OF ANCIENT ROME, by CYRIL BAILEY, M.A.
JUDAISM, by ISRAEL ABRAHAMS.
SHINTO: THE ANCIENT RELIGION OF JAPAN, by W. G. ASTON, C.M.G., LL.D.
BUDDHISM, by Professor T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, LL.D.

IN PREPARATION

THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT ISRAEL, by PROFESSOR JASTROW.
ISLAM IN INDIA, by T. W. ARNOLD, Assistant Librarian at the India Office, Author of "The Preaching of Islam."
THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT PERSIA, by DR. A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, Professor of Iranian at Columbia University.
PRIMITIVE OR NICENE CHRISTIANITY, by JOHN SUTHERLAND BLACK, LL.D., Joint Editor of the "Encyclopædia Biblica."
MEDIEVAL CHRISTIANITY.
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION, by DR. LEUBA.

Send for the New Illustrated Catalogue, "The Work of The Open Court Publishing Co." A Dictionary Catalogue by Authors including biographical sketches, and descriptions of the books in the various departments: Mathematics, Philosophy, Psychology, The History of Religions, Biology, etc., etc. An Index of Titles, Classified by Subjects; An Index of Names, Titles and Illustrations; also a list of Important Articles by Eminent Scholars. There are 50 full page illustrations, including many portraits of famous men. Free on request.

The Open Court Publishing Co.

P. O. Drawer F.

378-388 Wabash Ave., CHICAGO, ILL.

London: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO., Ltd.

Studies in Biblical Law

BY

HAROLD M. WIENER, *M.A., LL. B.*

OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
FORMERLY A SENIOR WHEWELL SCHOLAR OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

"As a whole, these 'Studies' are of unusual worth. They accomplish for certain Old Testament themes what Greenleaf, Lyttleton, and West did in New Testament lines . . . no one will doubt that the author has attempted a most important task and has succeeded well. He has done much to clear the atmosphere where there was overmuch fog. The work deserves to be well known among all students of the older part of God's Word."—*Review and Expositor*.

"It is bold and refreshing . . . our writer goes over ground trodden nearly two thousand years ago by the sages of the Mishnah; but he strikes out in his own line and stands forth much more logical than the old Pharisaic doctors."—*New York Evening Post*.

"There is no doubt that in this examination of the Biblical jurial laws Mr. Wiener has opened up a new and valuable source of information as to the dates of the various books of the Pentateuch."—*Academy*.

". . . both moral and interesting. . . The method employed is an ingenious and skillful application of the principles of legal interpretation to texts in apparent conflict."—*Harvard Law Review*.

"In the simplest and quietest way, though with a very firm grasp of the subject, the author shows the impossibilities, and in some cases the real absurdities, of certain contentions of modern criticism; and in our judgment he clearly convicts the writers . . . referred to of sacrificing reality and common-sense to matters of philological theory. . . . We recommend this volume to the careful attention of our readers."—*Churchman* (London).

"Altogether the volume is one of great importance and value."—*Bibliotheca Sacra*.

LONDON : DAVID NUTT
57-59 LONG ACRE

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

The Oldest Theological Quarterly in America

Prof. G. Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D., Editor

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Rev. Frank H. Foster, D.D., Ph.D., Olivet, Michigan.
Rev. James Lindsay, D.D., Kilmarnock, Scotland.
Rev. D. W. Simon, D.D., Bradford, England.
Rev. Hugh M. Scott, D.D., Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Charles F. Thwing, D.D., Pres. Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.
Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Rev. A. A. Berle, D.D., Boston, Mass.
Rev. W. E. Barton, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Henry A. Stimson, D.D., New York City.
Rev. William Edwards Park, D.D., Oberlin, Ohio.
Herbert William Magoun, Ph.D., Cambridge, Mass.

¶ As heretofore the *Bibliotheca Sacra* will aim to meet the wants of the more intelligent public, both lay and clerical of all denominations, in the publication of thorough discussions of all topics of permanent interest touching the Christian religion. Prominence will continue to be given to Biblical Criticism in its various departments; Theology in its doctrinal, historical and practical aspects; and the Relation of Philosophy, Science, and Oriental Discoveries to the Bible.

¶ The Quarterly will continue its elaborate and conservative discussion of the great sociological questions that are agitating the century, but will, as heretofore, be devoted mainly to discussions by competent authorities of the profound theological and critical problems which are agitating the entire Christian public. While remaining loyal to the historic faith of Christendom, it will aim to welcome and aid all real progress in every department of human activity.

¶ No biblical critic can afford to ignore the searching analysis of the Wellhausen theory by Mr. Harold Wiener, which is continued through the present year.

¶ On account of its long standing, and its undenominational character, the *Bibliotheca Sacra* probably has a wider circulation than any other American publication. Through it the ablest writers can at once reach every center of thought in the world.

¶ Whatever periodicals of a more popular character are taken by pastors, theological students, and the more intelligent laymen, such thorough discussions as appear in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* are indispensable to a complete mastery of the great themes that are constantly coming to the surface in modern thought.

Address,

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, *Oberlin, O.*

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

ARTICLE I.

THE ALLEGED COLLAPSE OF NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY.

THE collapse of New England Theology has been principally inferred from the alleged fact that it is no longer taught in any or in most of the Congregational seminaries in America. But if this be so, it still may be questioned whether this proves the collapse of the theology or of the seminaries. For, a theology which is full of truth is not collapsible.

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again:
The eternal years of God are hers."

If the New England theology incorporates into itself in usable form of statement the great body of biblical truth, then it has not collapsed, and it will not collapse; while, if the seminaries have turned their backs upon the central luminary and are walking in the light of "sparks of their own kindling," the question of *their* collapse is one of only a very short time.

Considered, also, from the viewpoint of actual facts, it is not clear that New England theology has collapsed, or that it is in the way of collapsing. Certainly the seminaries that have discarded it are not in a specially flourishing condition; while preaching of the Old New England type was never more effective than it has been during recent years. Witness the revivals which have attended the preaching of Moody, Pente-

cost, Torrey, Chapman, Campbell Morgan, and a host of other less well known but equally effective preachers.

The New England theology is a modified form of Calvinism, originating, about the middle of the eighteenth century, in the fertile mind of Jonathan Edwards during the great religious movement in America of which his ministry was the center. For more than a century and a half it has dominated the preaching of nearly all the denominations in the United States, and has been the mainspring of the home and foreign missionary efforts which have attained such wide-spread influence throughout both our own country and the world. In reality it does not differ much from the modified Arminianism of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America; while Andover Theological Seminary, which was its chief representative, furnished theological instruction for half a century to the most active minds of the Presbyterian, the Reformed, the Baptist, and the Protestant Episcopal, as well as of the Congregational churches. If a tree is ever recommended by its fruits, New England theology is worthy of preservation and nurture. At any rate it should not be cast off without much prayer and fasting, and urgent supplications that Divine wisdom may give us something better in its place. In view of these things, it is important for us to consider first, what the theology is which the age is said to be discarding; and secondly, what the would-be new leaders of thought are putting in its place.

Five great truths are made prominent in New England theology. These are: (a) the authority of the Bible; (b) the greatness of man; (c) the depth of man's depravity; (d) the exalted nature of Christ; and (e) the entrancing sublimity of the love of God as shown in the forgiveness of sin through the atoning work of Christ.

(a) No one can deny to the New England theologians great intellectual power and philosophical acumen. Nowhere at any time has appeared a brighter array of rational religious philosophers than that which adorns the pages of the history of New England theology. The works of Jonathan Edwards, father and son, of Hopkins, Emmons, Bellamy, Burton, Taylor, Tyler, Woods, Stuart, Smith, Beecher, Park, Finney, and Fairchild cannot be excelled in the boldness and power with which their authors face the rational problems underlying all theology. They were *rationalists* in the true sense of the word. But they subjected their reason to the Bible. They recognized it as the highest act of reason to accept the well-accredited testimony of witnesses better informed than they, and to incorporate the wisdom that is from above into their own systems. Under the influence of these men, therefore, biblical scholarship flourished as it had never done before in America, and as it is not likely to do again if the Bible ceases to be regarded as the highest source from which to derive knowledge of man's condition and of God's interest in his deliverance and development. Whatever else the New England theology was, it aimed to be biblical.

(b) According to the New England theologians, the greatness of man reaches its climax in those powers which render him a moral agent, capable of choosing between right and wrong. The freedom of the will is fundamental in the New England theology. This was a most important element of power in its preaching. Whatever may be said about the success of Jonathan Edwards in endeavoring to harmonize the freedom of the will with Divine foreknowledge and foreordination, the freedom of the will to choose between right and wrong was insisted upon in all his preaching and in that of his successors. Whatever punishment is threatened against man is deserved

by his voluntary rejection of the great law of love. In the New England theology, love is the fundamental law of the moral universe. Man knows by intuition that he should love all things, both great and small, according to their amount, and susceptibility of being. This comprehensive statement of the ground of obligation was formulated more fully by the New Haven and Oberlin theologians as the intuitive obligation to choose the good of being, instead of one's own pleasure, as the regulative rule of conduct. The possession of this power of choice is the highest attribute that can be conferred upon a created being. It is this which completes that image of God with which the Creator endowed our first parents.

But (*c*) the human race has betrayed its trust and sold its birthright. Everywhere man is in rebellion against his Creator, and is setting at naught the most sacred interests of the universe of which he is a part. Love is not the law regulating human conduct. Instead, everyone has gone his own way and is seeking his own pleasure, rather than the good of being. This truth is indeed taught with great clearness and force of statement throughout the Bible, but it is taught with equal clearness on the very face of human society and in all human history.

**"Man's inhumanity to man
Makes countless thousands mourn."**

Man nowhere trusts his fellow-man. All nations are in an attitude of defense against the anticipated depredations of their neighbors. France distrusts Germany; Japan fears Russia; England must have a navy, for self-protection, as large as that of any two of her rivals combined. Notwithstanding the effect of the benign influence of Christianity upon the nations of Europe for two thousand years, the dawn of universal peace is not yet even in sight.

Jails and state prisons everywhere abound, and are crowded with occupants. In organizing a new county, the first thing to be done is to establish courts, and to provide all the machinery necessary for the punishment of crimes, which, without believing in the doctrine of foreordination, all men know will be committed by some of the free moral agents with which we are associated. All sorts of checks have to be devised to keep cashiers from absconding with bank funds. Bell punches have to be used to compel conductors to turn in the money they collect from passengers, and uniformed spies have to follow them and keep a sharp lookout to see if the protective device is really employed. The Government has to appoint inspectors to see that manufactured articles are kept up to standard quality, and that meat is not rendered indigestible by the use of chemical preservatives, and milk diluted with impure water from the sewer or drawn from cows fed on distillery slops. Nothing but the force of government will compel mine owners and railroad magnates and manufacturers to take proper care of the lives and health of their operatives. Both parents and employers will combine to reap profit from the labor of children which dwarfs their bodies and stunts their minds. The sins of gigantic corporations have been too much in evidence the last few years to need more than a mention. The New England theology has not exaggerated the extent and depth of human depravity. It has done well to emphasize the "exceeding sinfulness of sin." The disease is deadly, and calls for a heroic remedy. No punishment is too severe for a man, made in God's image, who in selfish disregard rides roughshod over all the interests of those for whom Christ has died, and refuses to keep God in all his thoughts.

(d) It is quite the fashion nowadays to say that this dark view of human depravity has led to the construction of a me-

chamical theory of the atonement, in which a remedy was devised to be commensurate with the disease. The truth is, that orthodox theories of the atonement and the doctrine of total depravity support each other. The darker our conception of sin, the greater the necessity for a Divine mediator who can make atonement for it. On the other hand, the higher our conception of the nature of Christ and of the extent of his humiliation and suffering in man's behalf, the greater must seem the sin for which such a remedy had to be provided. The divinity of the suffering Saviour is a correlate to the deep view of sin which the New England theologians have ever maintained. The struggle to maintain the doctrine of the divinity of Christ which was so successfully carried on for three-quarters of a century at Andover, was not for the sake of a mere theory. The unfolding of Christ's nature and character in the Bible is a work of supererogation, unless there existed a reason for it in the wants of a lost race of godlike beings whose greatness was evidenced in its ruins.

(e) This leads naturally to a refutation of the oft-repeated slander that the New England theology represents God in the gloomy character of an arbitrary despot, whose laws are like those of the Medes and Persians which must be kept to the letter, no matter if it exacts the last drop of blood from the cringing defendant. So far is this from the truth, that we do not hesitate to say that the love and mercy of God are set forth in the New England theology with a strength and tenderness that are unequalled in any other literature of the world.

The earlier forms in which the doctrine of the atonement was set forth by Christian writers were under figures of speech which easily lead to much misapprehension. Yet, in all fairness, we should allow to them the benefit of supposing that they had some common sense, and that they expected their rep-

representations to be understood as figurative. It is hardly fair to the great theologians who have from time to time formulated the doctrinal statements to believe that they thought that we were in a literal sense "sold to Satan," so that we had literally to be redeemed as an ordinary piece of incumbered property has to be redeemed, or that the sufferings of Christ were identically the same as those would have been of the sinners whom he saved. Surely we should know enough of language to recognize figures of speech, and not compel them to go on all fours.

But the New England theologians successfully endeavored to introduce a higher analogy into the presentation of the nature and character of the Saviour's work. The New England theory of the atonement starts from our conceptions of the nature and character of government as obtained from daily and world-wide experience. Now, the highest attainment of human wisdom appears in our efforts to hold mankind up to the standard of duty for which governments exist. To restrain the lawless, to reform the vicious, to temper justice and mercy so that the first offenders shall not be wholly discouraged, and that the incorrigible shall not take undue advantage, and so that all shall be encouraged in obedience, are efforts in the highest range of human activity, and so the most appropriate field from which to draw our analogies for understanding the Divine government. These analogies have the advantage of being at once easily apprehensible, as expansive as the occasion may require, and in the highest degree effective. All are familiar with the fundamental principles underlying human government as seen in the family, the school, and the state. All are familiar with the danger which threatens the state when just laws are not enforced. All are more or less familiar with the hazards which attend the free forgiveness of offenders, and

the necessity of some corrective display of devotion to principle when pardon is granted to an incorrigible offender.

The law of self-sacrifice is the great mystery of the moral universe. We are so bound up with our fellow-men that all must suffer for the sins of others as well as for their own. The strongest motive which draws a wayward son towards virtue's path is the thought of the sorrow which his course is bringing upon the parents who have brought him into being and nurtured him in fond hope that he would have a noble career. The strongest general preventive to a wayward course is the spectacle of parents bowed down with sorrow for the ingratitude and heartlessness of children who have sold their birthright and are bringing their parents with sorrow to the grave. And so on every hand the innocent are called upon to bear the sins of the guilty.

To reform the slums some of the purest and most favored of their kind must go down and live with them, and by their own self-denial get underneath the lowest stratum of human depravity a leverage for love. In this mystery is involved that greater mystery which ever presses in all ages, "Why was it necessary for Christ to die to redeem sinners?"

This is by no means an idle question. Its answer involves the whole philosophy of existence, and all the puzzling questions which arise in trying to justify the ways of God in the creation of man. We must suppose that, in creating man with his superior intellect, and power of choice between good and evil, the Creator took into consideration all contingencies, and voluntarily assumed the responsibility of governing him as a free being. With such a being in it, persuasion must be depended upon, rather than compulsion, to preserve the interests of the moral universe. The incarnation, the suffering, and the death of Christ were not afterthoughts, but were provided for

at the beginning, and contemplated through all the previous ages of historical development. Because of the greatness of man, and of the grievousness of his departure from the paths of virtue, and of the seriousness of the calamities he was bringing upon himself, and of the disturbance he has created in the moral order of the universe, remedial agencies of the sublimest character were incorporated in the system by the Creator from the beginning.

It will not do to say that it is derogatory to Divine wisdom to suppose that remedial agencies were necessary for the perfection of the system which God has created. For, we cannot say that it is possible to serve all the interests of a race so highly endowed as man is without remedial agencies coming in to prevent irreparable loss when this highly endowed race goes astray. It is the same question that was raised by the Deists respecting Providence and miracles. If we consider mere mechanism, it is indeed derogatory to the wisdom of the mechanic that his clock should ever need repair and re-adjustment. But moral agents are not mere mechanism. They have the power of choice. They are in a most important sense the architects of their own fortunes. They must be governed by motives. They must not be left to remorseless destruction beneath the car of Juggernaut. That God undertook our deliverance through all the course of events which culminated on the Cross reveals love in its supremest aspect and degree, and manufactures a motive power surpassing in reality the highest flights of the human imagination.

"Oh, for this love let rocks and hills
Their lasting silence break,
And all harmonious human tongues,
The Saviour's praises speak."

To barter off this distinct, articulate, effective representation of God's love as revealed in the Bible, for the vague, hazy, and

diluted pantheistic conceptions of the New Theology, is worse than selling our birthright for a mess of pottage: it is parting with the substance of hope for the shadow of an illusion. It is exchanging gold tried in the fire for counterfeit scrip which nobody will honor, and which will not leave even ashes in the refining pot. For, what is the so-called Christianity which is being doled out to the sin-burdened, forlorn, sorrowing masses of mankind? It is a Christianity which belittles the authority of the Bible. It is a Christianity of their own manufacture, instead of the Christianity of the Gospels. They prate about the importance of coming under the influence of the "person of Christ," and yet through finical criticism discredit the history which gives us any idea of that person. For, all we know about the person of Christ comes from the Bible, and that, forsooth, we are told, is "merely a book." But, what higher product of the human mind is there than a good book? Does any one think we can keep a clear view of the person of Christ before the world by mere tradition, without the historical records of the Book? May we be delivered from bondage to the effusive lucubrations of the twentieth-century prophets, which the new theologians would fain substitute for the sure word spoken by the prophets of Israel, and by chosen apostles and companions of our Lord, the Christ of God!

ARTICLE II.

THE PLAGUES OF EGYPT.

BY EDWARD M. MERRINS, M.D., EAST ORANGE, NEW JERSEY.

II.

THE first series of plagues, covering about a year, consisted of (1) a low Nile, with the gloomy prospect of famine and pestilence; (2) a plague of frogs; (3) a plague of lice; (4) a plague of other insects; (5) a murrain of cattle; (6) an epidemic of *pestis minor*. All these calamities fell heavily upon the Egyptians, injuring their property, and causing much bodily discomfort and sickness. But the hearts of the people, and the heart of Pharaoh, notwithstanding his own sickness, remained unchanged. These plagues had only touched them externally, as it were, in body and estate; their inward nature had not been stirred so profoundly as to make them willing to liberate their slaves. The succeeding plagues of hail, locusts, darkness, and the death of the first-born, covering almost another year, were more searching, penetrating to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, for the Egyptians could not otherwise regard them than as the manifestations of the wrath of a powerful and hostile divinity.

THE SEVENTH PLAGUE.

The plague of rain, hail, lightning, and thunder.—It is difficult for us to enter fully and sympathetically into the religious emotions of the peoples of antiquity, in whom there dwelt fresh and strong the dark instincts formed when our primitive an-

cestors first began their intelligent struggle with the forces of nature, regarded as dread and inscrutable, and were often beaten and cowed by them. Perhaps these instincts partially survive in those among ourselves who are filled with unconquerable fear and restlessness during a thunder-storm, in spite of their education and every outward protection. What then must have been the fears of the Egyptians during this rare visitation of a terrible hail- and thunder-storm? "I am he who sendeth forth terror into the powers of rain and thunder. . . . I have made to flourish my knife, along with the knife which is in the hand of Thoth, in the powers of rain and thunder." But this terrible storm was not believed to come from Thoth or any other of their own divinities, for then it might have been more tolerable. The terror of it lay in the conviction that they were in the hands of the God of the Hebrews, who was showing Himself to be far more powerful than their own gods, and was directing his anger against them. They felt, as did their captives, that it was He, and no other, who thundered in the heavens, and uttered his voice; that the earth shook and trembled, because He was wroth; it was He who bowed the heavens, and came down; who shot out lightnings, and discomfited them; who gave over their cattle to the hail, and their flocks to hot thunderbolts; who cast upon them the fierceness of his anger, wrath, indignation, trouble, a band of angels of evil.

Allusion has already been made to a similar storm which occurred in France just before the great Revolution. "On the 13th day of July, 1788, there fell, on the very edge of harvest, the most frightful hail-storm, scattering into wild waste the fruits of the year, which had otherwise suffered grievously by drought. For sixty leagues round Paris especially, the ruin was almost total. To so many other evils then, there is to be

added, that of dearth, perhaps of famine.”¹ So it was with the Egyptians. They were dismayed by the immense damage the storm wrought. The flax and the barley were smitten, the vines, the fig-trees, and the sycamore-trees were destroyed, and much injury done to the herbs and trees of the field. Famine was foreseen with pestilence in its train, and “Death grinned horrible a ghastly smile, to hear his famine should be filled.”

Under this plague the spirit of the Egyptians began to break. The king was penitent. “And Pharaoh sent and called for Moses and Aaron, and said unto them: I have sinned this time: the Lord is righteous, and I and my people are wicked.” Afterward he hardened his heart.

THE EIGHTH PLAGUE.

The plague of locusts.—This plague stirred the religious fears of the people to a greater extent even than did the preceding plague, so awe-inspiring were the innumerable multitudes of locusts coming for weeks in a succession of swarms, and so frightful was the utter desolation left behind them. A modern traveler and biblical commentator, writing of a swarm of locusts he had seen, though it was but small and soon swept away by the wind, states that he felt “some degree of that singular helplessness before a calamity of portent far beyond itself, something of that supernatural edge and accent, which by the confession of so many observers, characterise the locust plague and the earthquake above all other physical disasters.”² To the Egyptians, as to the Israelites later in the time of Joel, the visitation of locusts was a sign of the great and terrible day of Jehovah, a day of darkness and murk, of cloud and heavy mist, when the sun and moon became black, the stars

¹ Carlyle, *French Revolution*, vol. i. chap. viii.

² G. Adam Smith, *Book of the Twelve Prophets*, p. 308.

withdrew their shining, and Jehovah uttered his voice before his army.

Differing only in degree, plagues of this kind are not uncommon in Egypt. "It often happens that immense swarms of locusts come in from Nubia. Wherever they appear they cover the ground for miles, and sometimes to the depth of two or more feet. It is in vain to attempt to drive them away. Only when the last bit of grain or grass is devoured do they depart, leaving behind those who in the dense mass of insects were hurt and cannot go further. It takes weeks to kill these remnants."

The eighth plague came to an end by an exceeding strong west wind driving the locusts into the Red Sea. It is said not one locust remained in all the border of Egypt, an emphatic way of stating that not one living swarm remained in the land. As the afflicted people always make desperate efforts to destroy the swarms, it is almost certain that numberless dead and injured locusts were left behind.

The visitation was indeed a calamity of portent far beyond itself. It made the horrors of famine inevitable. The land was an utter waste and desolation, for the locusts "did eat every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left, and there remained not any green thing in the trees, or in the herbs of the field, throughout all the land of Egypt."

It also prepared the way for the pestilence, for the dead bodies of locusts corrupted the air and soil, rendering the conditions extremely favorable for the development of all kinds of pathogenic germs, and undermining the resisting power of the human body to disease. Writing of the plague in the time of Justinian, the historian Gibbon observes that "Egypt and Ethiopia have been stigmatised in every age as the original home and seninary of the plague. In a damp, hot, stagnating

air, this African fever is generated from the putrefaction of animal substances, and especially from the swarms of locusts, not less destructive in their death than in their lives." Preceding the Black Death of the fourteenth century, vast river districts had been converted into swamps, foul vapors rose everywhere, increased by the odor of putrefying locusts, which had never perhaps darkened the sun in thicker swarms. In some places, "locusts which had been blown into the sea by a hurricane, and afterwards cast dead upon the shore, produced a noxious exhalation." In China during the same period, there was a similar pestilence, which was preceded by drought, and by innumerable swarms of locusts which destroyed the vegetation.¹

This was the first plague of which the mere prediction frightened the Egyptians. The courtiers of Pharaoh besought him to let the Hebrews go: "Knowest thou not yet that Egypt is destroyed?" He was willing to grant a temporary concession to Moses, but contumeliously refused to accede to all his requests. When the plague came, the king for a time was again in a penitential mood. Then, as usual, he hardened his heart.

THE NINTH PLAGUE.

The plague of darkness.—The simoon, the violent sand-storm of deserts, which gives a reddish dun color to the atmosphere, causing a kind of twilight, and affecting strangely both man and beast, is thought by some writers to have been this plague. As the simoon never lasts more than fifteen or twenty minutes, it does not meet the requirements of the narrative.

Others suppose it to have been one of the milder sand-storms which occur during the period of fifty days known as

¹ Hecker, *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*.

the *khamsin*. "Wherever the storm passes is heard a crackling sound as of electric sparks. A nervous depression seizes mankind. This is the Egyptian darkness." As these storms usually last for three days and nights, one of them of unusual strength might answer for the plague, if it were not for the objections that at the most it causes not darkness but a yellow fog, and that such a comparatively mild and familiar visitation, after the dreadful plagues which had preceded it, would not have been very terrifying to the Egyptians.

The opinion here advanced is that darkness covered the land, and a mysterious spiritual darkness covered the people, a darkness which was as the shadow of death from the immediate mental depression which it produced, and because it filled the hearts of the people with gloomy expectation of evils to come.

In the past it has happened more than once that, prior to an outbreak of bubonic plague, there have been strange atmospheric disturbances. Historians relate that in Cyprus, at the commencement of the epidemic of 1348, a pestiferous wind spread so poisonous an odor that many people, being overpowered by it, fell down suddenly and expired in dreadful agonies. The wind was followed by an earthquake and hurricane. In the same year a thick, stinking mist advanced from the east and spread itself over Italy, and this was followed by the plague.¹

A fog or darkness of this kind spreading itself along the

¹ "A dense and awful fog was seen in the heavens, rising in the east, and descending upon Italy" (Mansfield Chronicle). "Ingens vapor magnitudinis horribili boreali movens, region magno adspicuentium terrore dilabitur" (Stalind., Chron.). "Coelum ingravescit, aër impurus sentitur; nubes erassæ ac multæ lumina cœli obstruunt, immundus ac ignavus tepor hominum emollit corpora, exorients sol pallescit" (Chalrin, De Peste, p. 50). (Hecker, Epidemics of the Middle Ages.)

valley of the Nile, perhaps due to an awful convulsion of nature, as an earthquake either in Egypt itself or in a neighboring country, was an appalling plague, not only because of the inconvenience, loss, and distress which it caused, but also because the people knew not what it presaged. It aroused their superstitious fears; they could not but feel that hostile, supernatural forces were directed against their king, to whom, as the visible representative of the sun-god, hymns had been composed which praised him as the giver of light, and the dispeller of darkness.

“Give thy attention to me, thou Sun that risest
To enlighten the earth with thy goodness.
The solar orb of men chasing the darkness from Egypt.
Thou art as it were the image of thy father the Sun,
Who rises in heaven. Thy beams penetrate the cavern.
No place is without thy goodness.”

As in the myth of the Blind Horus, the Darkness for the time seemed to be gaining the victory over the Light.

In such a state of the public mind, weakened and distressed by a succession of strange disasters, various forms of mental disorder are very apt to appear among an ignorant and superstitious people. In the early months of 1907, the newspapers announced that the rulers of China were seriously alarmed over the famine which prevailed in their country, because they feared that a spread of hysteria might cause a general uprising. A few days later, came the report that the colored people of Jamaica, convinced that the great earthquake which occurred a short time before was a forewarning of the approaching judgment-day, were seized with religious mania, and had abandoned themselves to the excesses of religious excitement. So in earlier times. The terror which pervaded society during the epidemic of the Black Death led to the outburst of fanaticism,

with its outrages against public decency, known as Flagellatism.

"When we consider how ordinary and normal thoughts spread from one man to many and sway multitudes to the same view, it is no longer a mystery that morbid conditions of the mind should become at times no less epidemic than physical diseases. Such at least is the fact. A mental disorder may spread from man to man, and may involve whole nations. History demonstrates that dreams, delusions, superstitions, corruptions of language, all instincts and passions, even movements and cries, may assume the form, and to a certain extent may follow the laws, of epidemic diseases. There are records of a histrionic plague, when crowds conceived themselves players, and traversed the streets, and sank and died, repeating verses and exhibiting extravagant gesticulations; and of whole communities being stricken with night-mare, which was so general as to be supposed contagious. In one age hundreds are found possessed by Satan; in another, larger numbers are converted into wolves. In the constitution of the human mind, and in the education and the habits of life prevailing, there are still elements capable of realising the catastrophe suggested by Bishop Butler's question: What is to prevent a whole nation becoming mad?"

Is it not possible that the Egyptian people, in biblical language, were smitten with madness, blindness, and astonishment of heart, as the Israelites, just after they left Egypt, were threatened with if they did evil? (Deut. xxviii. 27.)

That the preternatural darkness of the ninth plague, with the dire foreboding it aroused of worse calamities to follow, led to the occurrence among the Egyptians of mental disorders is extremely probable; and as traditions in the East are transmitted from generation to generation with great fullness and accuracy, the account of this plague in "The Wisdom of Solomon" may be very close to the truth. According to this Jewish scripture, the Egyptians were not only in physical darkness, but were also in mental and spiritual darkness, and were the victims of strange hallucinations.

"For when unrighteous men thought to oppress the holy nation; they being shut up in their houses, the prisoners of darkness, and

fettered with the bonds of a long night, lay there exiled from the eternal providence.

"For while they supposed to lie hid in their secret sins, they were scattered under a dark veil of forgetfulness, being horribly astonished, and troubled with strange sights.

"For neither might the corner that held them keep them from fear: but noises as of waters falling down sounded about them, and sad visions appeared unto them with heavy countenances.

"No power of the fire might give them light: neither could the bright flames of the stars endure to lighten that horrible night.

"Only there appeared unto them a fire kindled of itself, very dreadful: for being much terrified, they thought the things which they saw to be worse than the sight they saw not."

"They that promised to drive away terrors and troubles from a sick soul, were sick themselves of fear, worthy to be laughed at.

"For though no terrible thing did fear them; yet being scared with beasts that passed by, and hissing of serpents,

"They died for fear, refusing to look upon the air, which could of no side be avoided."

"They were partly vexed with monstrous apparitions, and partly fainted, their heart failing them; for a sudden fear, and not looked for, came upon them.

"So then whosoever there fell down was straitly kept, shut up in a prison without iron bars.

"For whether he were a husbandman, or shepherd, or a laborer in the desert, he was overtaken and endured that necessity, which could not be avoided; for they were all bound with one chain of darkness.

"Whether it were a whistling wind, or a melodious noise of birds among the spreading branches, or a pleasing fall of water running violently,

"Or a terrible sound of stones cast down, or a running that could not be seen of skipping beasts, or a roaring voice of most savage wild beasts, or a rebounding echo from the hollow mountains: these things made them to swoon for fear."

"Over them was spread a heavy night, an image of that darkness which should afterward receive them; but yet were they unto themselves more grievous than the darkness."

Such hallucinations are not unknown to medical science. A French traveler has described, under the name of "*Le Ragle*," a transient hallucinatory disorder of the senses which happens not infrequently to wayfarers and dwellers in desert places,

especially to such as are in a state of general enfeeblement from antecedent sickness, as from extreme fatigue, want of food, and it may be even from depressing emotions such as anxiety, terror, and the like. This was almost exactly the condition of the Egyptians. The succession of plagues had brought them to a state of enfeeblement: scarcity of food, and sickness, had undermined the strength of the body; property losses had brought anxieties; regarded as portents, the plagues had shaken their fortitude and filled them with fears; mind and body were still further depressed by the *khamsin*, with its hot desert winds and violent sand-storms; then came the mysterious darkness of the ninth plague. It is not to be wondered at if they were thrown into mental disorder. Their hallucinations as depicted in the "Wisdom of Solomon" resembled very closely indeed the "hallucinations of the desert" of the French traveler, as may be seen from the following description:—

"These hallucinations are mostly of the sense of sight, more rarely of hearing, occasionally of smell and taste, and sometimes even, it would seem, of common sensation; and they vary much in type, not only in different persons, but also in their successive occurrences in the same person.

"Whoever becomes the subject of these hallucinations sees in the stones lying in his path either great rocks or buildings, or the foot-prints of animals; the wheel-track changes before his eyes into cultivated fields or meadows; a piece of level ground in the shadow, especially under moonlight, is taken for an abyss, or a ravine, or a spring of water; long trains of camels or wagons rise up before him, or files of soldiers whose very uniforms he thinks he can recognize. At another time he seems to be surrounded by extremely slim trees of immense height, whose foliage shuts out the sky overhead, while it does not screen the stars. Sometimes these objects seem to the victim of illusion to be so near that he thinks to put his hand on them; at other times he sees them far in the distance, and changing their forms according as he looks with open or half closed eyes.

"Less frequent than these hallucinations of sight are illusions of hearing; and the latter are particularly common with those whose

ears have been stupefied by the roaring of violent desert winds, or irritated by the sand, or who may be subject to noises in the ears. As in the case of illusions of sight, sensory impressions are confused and falsified, so that all kinds of phantasmagorias arise; the rustling of herbage, the noise of a stone striking the ground, the sighing of the wind, turn to a favorite air of music, the report of a gun, and so on.”¹

If the Egyptians were afflicted with hallucinations of this nature during the darkness of a dense and awful fog, it rationally explains the terrors of the ninth plague.

THE TENTH PLAGUE.

The death of the first-born.—“Meanwhile on a sudden, a severe plague fell upon that corrupt generation which soon destroyed such numbers of them, that the living scarce sufficed to bury the dead. Yet those that survived could not be withdrawn from the spiritual death which their sins had incurred, either by the death of their friends, or the fear of their own.” In these few words the Venerable Bede, in his ecclesiastical history, describes a pestilence which devastated England. It is not an inapt description of the moral state of the Egyptians, and of the judgment which fell upon them in the tenth plague.

According to the views here propounded, the sixth plague was an epidemic of *pestis minor*, or plague in its mildest form, which had prevailed during the winter months and then had rapidly declined with the setting in of hot weather. Many had been affected by it, including the king; but, as the mortality was low, and the true character of the disease not perceived, the plague made no deep impression. But in Egypt, as in other countries, the mild epidemic of one year is often

¹ D'Escayrac de Lauture, *Memoire sur “le ragle,” ou hallucination du desert*. Also Hirsch, *Geographical and Historical Pathology*, vol. iii. p. 530.

followed by an epidemic the next year of plague in its most malignant forms. This was the course of events now.

Weakened in body and cowed in mind, the Egyptians were not so well able to resist the second epidemic as they were the first, for not only had the disease increased in virulency, but during the interval there had been the plagues of hail, locusts, and darkness, bringing in their train the evils of dearth, the defiling of the soil with the dead bodies of innumerable locusts, obscuration and depression of mind, in short, general suffering in mind, body, and estate, so that in their debilitated state they readily fell victims to the contagion. In the words of the Psalmist, God had made a path for his anger, and then spared not their soul from death, but gave their life over to the pestilence.

The ordinary form of bubonic plague (*pestis major*) is characterized by fever, headache, delirium, or stupor; (in the Justinian epidemic the mind was first attacked, anxious fears and saddening visions seeming to overpower the reasoning faculties;) large and painful buboes appear on different parts of the body; the face is flushed; the eyes red and turbid; the tongue black, dry, and fissured, and sometimes paralyzed; the teeth and gums covered with sordes.¹ In the worst cases, dark

¹ Evagrius, in his "Ecclesiastical History" (lib. iv. c. xxviii.) describes a diphtheritic or tonsillar form: "It took some men first in the head, made their eyes as red as blood, and puffed up their cheeks; afterwards it fell at their throats, and whomsoever it took, it despatched him out of the way." Attacking a famine-stricken population, perhaps this is the fearful plague mentioned by the prophet Zechariah: "Their flesh shall consume away while they stand on their tongue shall consume away in their mouth. . . . And so shall their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their sockets, and be the plague of the horse, of the mule, of the camel, and of the ass, and of all the beasts. . . . And if the family of Egypt go not up, and come not, upon them shall be the plague. . . . This shall be the punishment of Egypt."

petechia spots, pustules, and carbuncles appear, the "tokens" mentioned by historians. This form is *only* indirectly infectious, and while very fatal, is not so bad as the septicæmic and pneumonic varieties.

In the septicæmic or fulminant form, the system of the patient is overwhelmed, as it were, by the infection; he is struck down suddenly, and dies before the characteristic signs of the disease have time to appear.

In the very fatal pneumonic variety, directly infectious from man to man, the lungs bear the brunt of the infection, and buboes usually are absent. (As "boils" are not mentioned in connection with the tenth plague as they are with the sixth, this pneumonic form was possibly the most common in the second epidemic.) It begins with a chill followed by nausea, dizziness, pains in the head and body, and fever; in a few days the pulmonary symptoms appear,—pain in the chest, rapid and difficult breathing, incessant cough, dark and bloody expectoration, all combined with a sickening odor from both body and breath; later there are hemorrhages, the heart and respiration fail, the patient dies. This was the "Black Death" which swept over Europe and other parts of the world in the fourteenth century, and caused the death of 25,000,000 people. In confirmation of this conjecture as to the specific nature of the tenth plague, is the fact that Egypt was one of the countries visited by the Black Death. "Here also inflammation of the lungs was predominant, and destroyed quickly and infallibly with burning heat and expectoration of blood. Here too the breath of the sick spread a deadly contagion, and human aid was in vain as it was fatal to those who approached the infected."¹

¹ Degulnes, *Histoire générale des Huns, etc.*, tom. iv. p. 226; Hecker, *op. cit.*

This was the last, and surely the most dreadful, in the series of heavy judgments which smote the Egyptians before they were willing to liberate the Hebrews. Commencing in the winter, it lasted until the following spring and summer, reaching its height in March and April, just about the time when the exodus occurred. As the weeks passed, and it increased in virulency and contagious power, the number of its victims correspondingly increased. The mortality may be estimated by that of subsequent epidemics. In the city of Cairo alone, when the Black Death was raging, from ten to fifteen thousand people died each day. In 1603 there was an epidemic of plague in Egypt which destroyed at least one million of the inhabitants. Who can picture the horrors of the plague, intensified as these were by the famine which followed the plagues of hail and locusts? "Encompassed by the wilderness, the unfortunate natives were unable to escape; they died in heaps; the Nile valley resembled a field of battle; each village became a charnel house; skeletons sat grinning at street corners, and the winds clattered among dead men's bones. A few survivors lingered miserably through the year, browsing on the thorny shrubs of the desert, or sharing with the vultures their horrible repast." This is a description of plague in the most remote period of Egyptian history, but it may give some idea of its ravages at the time of the exodus.

During the course of the epidemic, there came a week when the mortality was appallingly great, perhaps one particular night¹ when it seemed as if the angel of the pestilence had in-

¹ "The plague was so violent that it not only took away all mean of preparing a good end, but *in a few hours* in Surat, Daman, and Thana, carried off whole cityfuls of people, and at Ta'tha in Sind killed 80,000 souls" (Gemelli Careri in Churchill's *Voyages*, vol. iv. p. 191; Simpson, *Treatise on Plague*, p. 45).

Referring to the destruction of Sennacherib's army, a modern

deed passed through the land, and smitten every Egyptian household. "Suddenly, visions of horrible dreams troubled them sore, and terrors came upon them unlooked for. And one thrown here, and another there half-dead, shewed the cause of his death. And a lamentable noise was carried abroad for children that were bewailed. The master and the servant were punished after one manner; and like as the king, so suffered the common person. So they altogether had innumerable dead with one kind of death; neither were the living sufficient to bury them; for in one moment, the noblest offspring of them was destroyed." The whole nation was in a state of panic and woe. Pharaoh rose up in the night, he and all his servants, and all the Egyptians; and there was a great cry in Egypt; for there was not a house where there was not one dead. And the Egyptians were urgent upon the Hebrews

writer makes this statement: "Those who have watched the swift march of pestilence through the plains of India, when in one night thousands are sometimes carried off by cholera—who have seen individuals drop dead within an hour of the first attack,—will not be disposed to cavil at the truth of the Scripture narrative, either in respect of the multitude or the rapidity of the slaughter of a single night. At a time when profane history is perfectly trustworthy, we learn that a pestilence carried off in Rome in a single day not less than ten thousand people. And in our own land [England] within two years of the time at which we write, a pest, scarcely less to be dreaded than any of ancient times—scarlet fever—has stricken down thousands of its feeble victims in a few hours, assuming a magnitude and an extent which, could all the victims of one day be collected together in a mass, would appall the mind of the sternest" (Cornhill Magazine, May, 1865).

Defoe, in his *Journal of the Plague Year*, has the following: "Nay, one of the most eminent Physicians, who has since published in Latin an Account of those Times, and of his Observations, says that in one Week there died Twelve Thousand People, and that particularly there died Four Thousand in one Night; tho' I do not remember that there ever was any such particular Night so remarkably fatal, as that such a Number died in it."

to send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead men (Ex. xii. 33). Like the god in the Assyrian legend of Kutha, Pharaoh no doubt uttered the despairing cry: "Verily now, and I, what have I left to reign over? I am a king who brings not peace to his land, a prince who brings not peace to his hosts. Why have I established only corpses, and left a desert? Terror of men: with night, death, and plague I have cursed it."

"O eloquent, just and mightie Death! whom none could advise, thou hast perswaded; what none hath dared, thou hast done; and whom all the world hath flattered, thou only hast cast out of the world and despised."

Nothing could have restrained the Egyptians more effectively from venting their anger and hatred upon the Hebrews, and allowing them to depart in peace, than this terrible epidemic which plunged them into the depths of misery, and benumbed all their faculties and activities, misery which the prayers and incantations of their priests were unable to alleviate, so that all felt themselves in the grasp of a mighty Power, whom it were folly to resist. When the Hebrews had gone, there was a reaction. "What is this we have done, that we have let Israel go from serving us?" This is in accord with human nature. Following the deep despair felt when an epidemic is at its worst, there is often a total revulsion of feeling, with a display of the worst passions of the human heart. The historic verisimilitude of the narrative is very striking.

There are certain points of this tenth plague which require separate consideration. First, as to the meaning of "first-born." If the first-born only of men and animals were singled out and destroyed, then the plague is inexplicable on natural grounds. But is the term to be taken quite literally? In the

Bible it is often used figuratively. Thus Christ is said to be "the first-born of every creature," and "the first-born of the dead." Isaiah speaks of "the first-born of the poor," i.e., the most miserable of the poor (Isa. xiv. 30). In the book of Job, one of the characters, referring to the doom of the wicked, states that "calamity shall be at his side; it shall devour the members of his body, yea, the first-born of death shall devour his members" (xviii. 13). Here "first-born of death" refers to death's chief instrument, some fatal malady. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews mentions the "church of the first-born," meaning thereby those who possessed the privilege of heavenly citizenship. The whole Israelitish nation is elsewhere spoken of as "the first-born of God," i.e., objects of his special favor. In Psalm lxxxix. 27 it is said, "I will make him my first-born," meaning that David would be put in the position of the first-born. In Egyptian literature, we come across such sentences as: "Hail, Ra, thou who art content, thy heart is glad by reason of thy beautiful law of the day; thou comest forth at the east, and the divine first-born beings who are in thy presence, cry out with gladness unto thee." In another place, the Chancellor-in-chief, Nu, the triumphant, saith, "I have taken my seat among the first-born gods of Nut." In a passage already quoted from the Apocrypha, those who died from the tenth plague were said to be "the noblest offspring" of the Egyptians.

In the light of this usage, the term "first-born" need not be taken too literally. The Psalmist (lxxviii. 50-51), referring to the plagues of the exodus, says that God

"made a path for his anger;
He spared not their soul from death,
But gave their life over to the pestilence;
And smote all the first-born in Egypt,
The chief of their strength in the tents of Ham."

And in another Psalm (cv. 36) it is said:—

“He smote all the first-born in their land,
The chief of all their strength.”

In the first passage the words “their soul” do not refer to the Egyptians in general, nor to godless Israelites, but to the first-born of the Egyptians, who are described in the (doubtless) true text as “the sons that they delighted in,”¹ an explanation confirmed by the parallelism of the second passage. If this is the meaning of first-born, the chief of all their strength, it harmonizes very well with the age statistics of plague epidemics.² The same explanation is applicable to the death of the first-born of animals: the best and strongest succumbed.

¹ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, article “Plague.”

² When the plague was at Constantinople in A.D. 558, “people of all ages perished indiscriminately, but especially the young and vigorous and in the flower of youth, and of them the males and the females were not affected so much” (*Agathie Scholastici Historiarum*). (Simpson, *Treatise on Plague*, p. 12.)

In the English epidemic of 1348, “it was the young and strong that the plague chiefly attacked. The old and feeble it commonly spared” (*Le Baker de Swynebroke*). (Quoted in Simpson’s *Treatise*, p. 24.)

In an epidemic of plague in 1876 at Hillah, on the banks of the Euphrates, 1,826 patients died. Of these, 277 belonged to the first decade of life; 617 to the second; 432 to the third; 292 to the fourth. Altogether 1,618, out of a total of 1,826, were under forty years of age, and of these nearly 900 (to be exact 894) were under twenty.

It has been recently suggested that the visitation of plague to the town of Hamelin in 1284 is the historic fact which underlies the legend of “The Pled Piper of Hamelin.” After destroying the rats which swarmed in the town, the plague broke out among the people. Most of those who died were children. On their way to burial, the corpses of the little ones were borne along the Bungen-strasse,—

“Where anyone playing on pipe or tabor
Was sure for the future to lose his labor,
Nor suffered they hostelry or tavern
To shock with mirth a street so solemn.”—

to the plague pit dug in the mountain side without the city. (Mackintosh, *The Lancet*, April 2, 1904, p. 970.)

Another moot point is the exemption of the Israelites from the plague. This is remarkable, but not incredible. As already observed, epidemics of plague differ immensely and curiously in their diffusive power. Of places apparently under the same conditions, and in free communication with one another, one is repeatedly infected, the other never. In India there are two villages on the same mountain, with the same aspect, scarcely five hundred yards apart, of which at every visitation of plague, one always escaped, the other always suffered.¹

During the first outbreak of plague in Canton in 1894, in which 80,000 out of the 1,600,000 inhabitants died, the disease never crossed the narrow creek, some twenty yards wide, which separated plague-infected houses in the Chinese town from the European settlement of Shamien; neither Europeans, nor the Chinese servants on the premises, nor the rats, in the foreign settlements, were affected.

At Poona, in India, over six months elapsed before the disease established itself at Kirkee, which was in daily communication with Poona and only separated by a river spanned by a bridge.²

Again, long ago it was observed in Egypt, that Alexandria might have a terrible epidemic, while Cairo entirely escaped; in another epidemic the converse relation might obtain; and this in spite of unchecked communication. "Almost all the authorities agree concerning the diffusion of the plague in Egypt, that lower Egypt has always been the headquarters of the disease; that it has not infrequently extended to upper Egypt, but has always reached its limit in Assouan, never going higher than the first cataract, and never entering Nubia."³

¹ Allbutt, *System of Medicine*, vol. I. p. 924.

² *The Lancet*, June 29, 1907.

³ Hirsch, *Geogr. and Hist. Pathol.*, vol. I. p. 506.

At the time of the Black Death, certain cities in an unaccountable manner remained quite free.¹

To the Hebrews, who referred all natural and historical phenomena immediately to God as first and universal cause, this exemption was proof of his loving protection, and perhaps led the Psalmist (xci. 5-7) to say:—

“Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night,
Nor for the arrow [plague] that flieth by day;
For the pestilence that walketh in darkness,
Nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday.
A thousand shall fall at thy side,
And ten thousand at thy right hand;
But it shall not come nigh thee.”

Lastly, reference may be made here to an Egyptian tradition, recorded by Josephus, in his controversy with Apion. The latter alleged that after the exodus, “when the Jews had travelled a six days’ journey, they had buboes in their groins; and that on this account it was that they rested on the seventh day, as having got safely to that country which is now called Judæa; that then they preserved the language of the Egyptians and called that day the Sabbath, for that malady of buboes in their groin was named Sabbatosis by the Egyptians.” Josephus in his reply, after pointing out that the words *sabbo* and “Sabbath” differ widely in their meaning, admits that the word *sabbo* denoted among the Egyptians the malady of a bubo in the groin. Considering the wonderful perpetuity of tradition in the East, this is strong evidence that bubonic plague was epidemic at the time of the exodus. In the transmission of the story from one generation to another through centuries, national pride and prejudice made the Egyptians shift the disease from their own ancestors, and impute it to the Hebrews. Such perversions of history are not uncommon.

¹Hecker, *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*; Simpson, *Treatise on Plague*, pp. 36, 43.

It may be objected that if the view of the plagues here presented be the true one, then they were nothing more than the operations of nature, indifferent alike to the evil and the good, so that the Egyptians were astray in regarding them as indications of God's displeasure, and the Israelites were astray in thinking they were signs of his guardianship. To this it may be replied, that in the Bible,

"nature with its ordered sequence of cause and effect, laws without which natural science is impossible, the uniformity, the coherence, the intelligibility of nature as an organised whole,—everything is subordinated to the one dominant thought of the omnipresence of God, and his care for the creatures he has made in his likeness. . . . Those observed uniformities, which we, in our realistic way, have come to think of as somehow controlling nature, are elastic and pliant under his hand. The moral purpose is everywhere supreme over physical order, not merely as if it were a higher power to which the physical is compelled to yield unwilling submission, but as that in which the physical order finds its own *raison d'être*."

Is not this teaching true?

Suppose we take the lowest view, that Moses was an extremely clever man who arrived in Egypt with the intention of delivering his people just when a series of terrible calamities was about to fall on the country, and that as each calamity fell, he announced at once that it was a judgment of the God of the Hebrews; to say the least, the concatenation of events was wonderful, and if all were due to chance, it is difficult not to believe that Providence the chance did guide. This was the impression made upon those most immediately concerned. The Hebrews regarded their scatheless deliverance as a marvelous exhibition of God's protecting care. Was it possible for them to think otherwise? Their oppressors abominated them, had made their lives bitter with hard service, had tried to exterminate them as a nation by destroying all the male children; and the hatred of the Egyptians was intensified by the plagues

which came upon them, aggravated as these were by the announcement that each plague was sent by the God of their captives. The dominant race when greatly exasperated by those in its power, is seldom restrained by just or merciful considerations, as the subsequent history of the Jews abundantly testifies; for it has been their sad destiny to be hated and oppressed in every age and by every nation. To mention but a few familiar instances. The Assyrians and Babylonians exiled or slaughtered them. A Persian king readily assents to measures for the extermination of those in his kingdom, simply because "their laws are diverse from those of every people; neither keep they the king's laws; therefore it is not for the king's profit to suffer them" (Esther iii. 8). At the destruction of Jerusalem, hundreds of thousands were exiled or slain.

These things were done under the shade of the dry tree of heathenism, but under the green tree of Christendom the Jews have fared little better. In 1253, those who were in England, no longer able to withstand the constant hardships to which they were subjected in person and property, begged of their own accord to be allowed to leave the country; in 1290 they were driven from their shores, pursued by the execrations of an infuriated people. In France, from the eleventh to the fourteenth century, their history is a series of successive massacres and banishments. So in Germany, in Italy, and in Spain. Of special interest, in connection with this subject of the Plagues, is the fact that at the time of the Black Death, they were everywhere accused of the most hideous crimes, and were murdered and burned by thousands. "In short, whatever deeds fanaticism, revenge and desperation, in fearful combination could instigate mankind to perform,—and where in such cases is the limit? were executed in the year 1349 through-

out Germany, Italy, and France, with impunity, and in the eyes of all the world."

Is it any wonder then that the Jews of every generation have regarded the deliverance of their ancestors at the time of the exodus as an unique event, wrought by the mighty hand and outstretched arm of their God, and that it has sustained them in the course of their long and troubled history, and kept them true to their vocation of being God's witnesses and messengers in the vast work of redeeming the world? In the wake of their prophets and psalmists, they never weary of dwelling on what God did for them when they were a child-people. "When Israel was a child I, the Lord, loved him, and out of Egypt called him to be my son." If the Jews had not been sustained by such memories, if in their despair when calamities fell upon them, they had forsaken the faith of their forefathers instead of recognizing that in such events they were being trained for their high calling, the world's loss would have been great and lasting, perhaps irreparable. The salvation of the world has been of the Jews.

The Egyptians suffered greatly, but their sufferings were neither meaningless nor fruitless. The plagues actually were manifestations of the displeasure of God, inasmuch as his displeasure is always revealed through the laws of nature against whatever is evil either in the physical or in the moral world. and the Egyptians were offenders in both. The worst of the plagues—the fifth, the sixth, the tenth, perhaps also the third and the fourth—sprang from insalubrious conditions of the soil, the filth of houses and streets, and from the neglect of the laws of personal health. The misery of the other plagues was deepened by superstitious fears. Therefore, by means of the plagues the Egyptians were being taught, and through them mankind, the laws of physiological and sanitary righteousness,

and that such laws are bound up with the moral law. For superstition and bigotry hinder the perception of the laws of health, and obstruct their enforcement. In India at the present time the efforts of the British government to extirpate the plague are thwarted in every direction by the religious beliefs and customs of the natives, so that the disease is pursuing its course almost unchecked, its victims in the first six months of 1907 numbering over one million. So with the Egyptians. Their mummification of the bodies of those who died of the plague did much to spread the disease.¹ On the other hand, in this and other epidemics, when the plague was at its worst, thousands died whose bodies it was not possible to embalm, and for whom no funeral rites were performed. This helped to break the strength of low or immature religious customs, and prepared men's minds for the introduction of new and better ideas. The stern teachings of nature made the Egyptians the pioneers of medicine and sanitation. The Papyrus Ebers proves that, centuries before Hippocrates, there were learned men in Egypt who could make intelligent observations of disease, combine complicated prescriptions, and use them with judgment. If they made no great discoveries in medical science, at least their errors were warnings to men, and their experiences the raw material of knowledge.

Famine and pestilence, the great scourges of olden time, are now felt only, or principally, in the countries of the East, where they still destroy myriads of men, women, and children. In this country of abundant harvests, with constant and rapid

¹ Undertakers and those who lay out the dead are apt to contract the disease. In Hongkong many of the undertakers perished, and there is a general impression among the Chinese that the corpse is more dangerous than the living patient. Attendance at funerals, especially when connected with feasting or ceremonial rites, is often dangerous, plague afterwards affecting those who have been present (Simpson's *Treatise on Plague*, p. 213).

means of communication with other countries, there is no fear of famine. With the strict enforcement of sanitary and quarantine laws, now that yellow fever has been conquered, there is little danger of any terrible epidemic sweeping over the country. In the midst of all this plenty and security, perhaps there is a tendency to forget the pit whence we were digged, and to forget or doubt the heavy penalties which those who lived before us had to pay for their ignorance and violation of the laws of health. The records and traditions of past calamities ought not to be rejected unless clearly proved to have no basis of historic fact. In any event, it is much easier to believe that an annual festival or other celebration by a whole nation, is held in memory of some episode that really took place, than to believe the celebration came first and a story was afterwards concocted to account for it. A learned canon writes: "Even Old Testament critics have thought it worth while to conjecture that some calamities which may have fallen upon Egypt may have been transformed into the so-called plagues. A needless suggestion." Why needless, as if the matter were no longer open to consideration? As bearing on the credibility of narratives of epidemics in ancient times, we quote from the letter of a former canon of the church, the poet Petrarch, canon of the cathedral of Parma, who was an actual eye-witness of the scenes to which he alludes. At the time of the Black Death, he wrote to his brother, in words which might fittingly have been used by a contemporary of Moses: "Will posterity ever believe these things when we, who see, can scarcely credit them? We should think we were dreaming if we did not with our eyes, when we walk abroad, see the city in mourning with funerals, and returning to our home find it empty, and thus know that what we lament is real. Oh! happy people of the future, who have not known these miseries, and perchance will class our testimony with the fables."

ARTICLE III.

RECOLLECTIONS OF LINCOLN.

BY HONORABLE J. O. CUNNINGHAM, URBANA, ILLINOIS.

"His was no lofty mountain-peak of mind,
Thrusting to thin air o'er cloudy bars,
A sea-mark now, now lost in vapors blind;
Broad prairie rather, genial, level-lined,
Fruitful and friendly for all human kind,
Yet also nigh to heaven and loved of loftiest stars,
For many a year and many an age,
While History on her ample page
The virtues shall enroll
Of that paternal soul!"—RICHARD HENRY STODDARD.

No name in American history evokes greater interest and enthusiasm, not only among Americans, but also among the people of all civilized lands, than does that of the name of our first martyred president.

Great events and sad events in our national history transpiring since he ceased to live and act, have failed to dim the public interest in him. More than this, his name has become permanently etched upon the World's scroll of fame as a benefactor of races and as an exponent of true nobility of character. Notoriety has given to others an evanescent fame which fades with half a generation, but it is a lofty character and personality alone which wins for one the position occupied by him in history!

The reasons underlying and making possible this condition are not solely due to his public career as President of a mighty nation and the Emancipator of a race from human chatteldom,

but rather or quite materially to reasons connected with his personality as a man and member of society before his advancement to the presidential chair. This period of his life distinguishes him and his relations to history over the great majority of men who have succeeded in raising themselves above the common herd of humanity.

It was during this period of his life, his unofficial and professional life, that the writer, from political and professional associations, was given opportunities for a somewhat close acquaintance with and study of the man.

On the fourteenth day of February, 1809, there was born to Thomas Lincoln and his wife, Nancy Hanks Lincoln, in their primitive, windowless, cabin home, in what was then Hardin County, Kentucky, the child Abraham: so called for his paternal grandfather, whose tragic death at the hands of a band of marauding Indians a few years prior had helped to paint the "dark and bloody" soil of that State.

It was to no life of luxury and ease that this child of the forest was born! Fortunately for him and for his country, "poor white" parentage did not entail poverty in mental and moral qualities; nor does a low financial condition of parentage necessarily destine the subject to a lowly life. American history is rich in instances wherein the highest offices have been filled by the offspring of the class known in the South as "poor white trash," who have transmitted, unimpaired, mental qualities inherent in the Scotch and British ancestry which originally peopled the mountains and frontiers of that section.

Lincoln was born to orphanage—for, at an early age, he lost his mother by an untimely death; to a life of toil; to a heritage of debt; to a youth of struggle for existence. In his boyhood, no partial friend made the acquisition of knowledge easy to

him and paved the way to collegiate honors; no ample library at his home or town afforded him the means for the acquisition of such knowledge nor for mental recreation; no graded school received him at the age of six and matriculated him in college at sixteen. His childhood, that usual period of poetry, was devoid of every ease, and he was early in life inured to toil and privation. His school of science was only the open book of Nature as revealed in the woods and hills of Kentucky and Indiana. His only helps in getting on in the world were his brawny hands and his stout heart, spurred on by an American boy's ambition. He wore the homespun clothing of flax and wool wrought by the loving and nimble fingers of his mother, and he early exchanged the ease of infancy for the labors of the fields and the woods. His hours of recreation were taken from those of repose, and his hands were calloused by the use of the axe and the plow.

While stately mansions in the surroundings of cultured refinement furnished the homes of such of his predecessors in the presidency as the Adamses, Madison, Monroe, and Van Buren, the rude forest cabin was the home of Lincoln during his childhood, and the feeble firelight his evening cheer. Even when professional success had made life for him easier, it brought with it none of the habits and surroundings of luxury.

His story, from his cabin home in Kentucky to abundant professional success in Illinois and finally to the presidential mansion, was the story of Garfield and of McKinley and of many another youth who, if not reaching presidential honors and worldly renown, has by well-directed efforts earned fame in other directions, and has taught other aspiring youths the possibilities within the reach of the helpless but ambitious poor who are so fortunate as to be born under our liberal institutions.

Nature made Lincoln a nobleman and a ruler of men: a humble and obscure birth and the adverse surroundings of his childhood and early manhood failed to stamp out the impress!

The numerous and well-written histories of Mr. Lincoln tell the story of his life from the cabin to the White House from a public standpoint; but they only scantily tell of his life upon the eighth Judicial Circuit of Illinois, where, from the year 1836 to 1860, at the first as a briefless barrister, he wooed success at the bar and in politics, at the beginning with but a poor equipment of legal learning, and later on professional success as an able and conscientious lawyer. Here he was matured, and that character which so makes for him among men was strengthened. Here the writer first met him, and in this capacity, and as a campaigner in the political contests occurring there once in two years, best knew him.

The reader, unacquainted with the unavoidable conditions surrounding the administration of justice in all newly and sparsely settled countries, will need be told that to reach the present condition of dignity and propriety always looked for and found in our courts of justice in the states of the Middle West, a long stride has been made and primitive conditions have been overcome.

When Jacob Burnett traveled a circuit extending from the Ohio River to Lake Erie, and George Tod held all the Common Pleas courts in Northern Ohio, each traveling on horseback, with perhaps a retinue of lawyers in his train, from county to county, spending nights in the shelter of the woods, or better, if so fortunate, in some friendly cabin along the route, and dispensed justice in some log court-house from improvised "benches," a day or so at each county, a very different condition prevailed from that now seen in the same territories, where, from many elegant court-houses and with a

uniform formality, the same laws are enforced by many judges for the benefit of a dense and wealthy population.

Similar conditions prevailed in Central Illinois during a large part of the time while Lincoln was upon the circuit. Judges Samuel H. Treat and David Davis, his successor, for many years held the *nisi prius* courts in the fourteen counties of the eighth Judicial Circuit, which territory extended from the Illinois River on the west to the Indiana line on the east, and included Springfield, the home of Lincoln.

These judges, like Judges Burnett and Tod in Ohio, in turn traveled their circuit on horseback or in rude wagons, with the usual retinue of lawyers following, of whom, and at least semi-annually, Lincoln was one for many years up to 1860. Urbana, the residence of the writer during many of these years, was the seat of justice for Champaign County, and there Mr. Lincoln, from his frequent visits as a lawyer, was well known to all, and his presence upon the streets was a familiar one. This was the common lot of all lawyers who as early as the period of which this is written wooed success in the profession, except in the counties more densely inhabited. Hard fare, small fees, and little of reputation among a limited clientage were in most cases the first-fruits of this life.

This long-continued association between the two chief characters above alluded to—Judge Davis and Mr. Lincoln—continued for half a lifetime as lawyers traveling the circuit together, or as judge and practising lawyer when one had been elevated to the bench, and begat, as was natural where mutual confidence exists as in that case, a most intimate and close friendship between them, which continued unabated to the last.¹

¹ Singularly enough, it was Judge Davis, the bosom friend and companion of the War President, whom he, at the first opportunity

This life upon the circuit as a lawyer, varied by his participation in the biennial political contests, upon which Mr. Lincoln entered when admitted to the bar in 1836, brought him constantly into close contact with the common people as suitors, witnesses, jurors, as well as with the cabin dwellers along the traveled roads and traces leading from county-seat to county-seat. They were largely of the same classes of people among whom he had been born and with whom he had dwelt in Indiana and at New Salem. These associations tended to continue in him a love for plain language, plain people, and plain living, including a homely style of expressing himself in conversation, upon the rostrum, before juries, and in putting his thoughts upon paper, now so much admired by even critics, who have made a study of his speeches and papers. Under the changed conditions of his later life, he never seemed to seek to throw off those early habits of living, thinking, and speaking, further than to remedy the defects in pronunciation and grammar; for his language, as it is remembered and as it has been preserved to us in his speeches, is as correct in diction as it is homely in style, and free from pedantry and excessive use of words.

In court Mr. Lincoln was always genial and courteous, never quarreling with either the court or with his brother lawyers. His arguments to juries were plain talks, becoming emphatic as the occasion required. The writer served upon a jury after he had attained the high office, elevated to the Supreme Federal bench, who, after the death of the President, when all heads and hearts were well cooled, upon the consideration of the Milligan case, imprisoned by a military court for alleged disloyalty, announced the unanimous opinion of that high court in condemnation of the assumption of the power by the President and military courts to imprison Northern men for alleged disloyalty, where the ordinary courts of the country were unimpeded in the exercise of an unquestioned jurisdiction for the punishment of such offenders.

but once in his life, and then Lincoln was the attorney for one of the parties, and his methods were carefully observed and noted. One telling peculiarity of his, in entering upon an argument of this kind, was to begin by conceding to his adversary every point in the case contended for by him which was not in his estimation material and vital, or which might safely be granted, thus at once disposing of irrelevant points and giving the impression of fairness to his opponent. This done, but no more, his manner changed; and, with the expression "But," he would very simply and plainly point out to his jury, who by this time he had well won to him, the real and vital points upon which the case must turn, and would apply the evidence in the case so as to show that the only conclusion possible for the jury must sustain his client's case. If the evidence failed to make this course of argument possible, and showed the right and law to be with his opponent, Lincoln was disarmed, for the art of dissimulation was to him unknown.

That he never took cases lacking merit, and in fact tried his client's case and rendered judgment before accepting it, discarding all cases not absolutely meritorious, as some writers have claimed, is a fiction of the imagination of these biographers. Like other lawyers, he desired the strong side of the case, but he recognized in all cases the right of a candid client or accused person to a fair trial, and to have his case honestly presented to the court and jury to the best advantage, with all the presumptions of the law in his favor. This is a course always possible and within the bounds of the most exacting propriety.

Some commentators upon the life and associations of Mr. Lincoln have with much minuteness, and as much error, left it to be understood that in his intercourse with his associates the lowest familiarity on the part of his companions was exercised

and tolerated, in that he was constantly addressed and referred to in his presence by the name of "Abe." Nothing could be said upon this phase of his life which would be more erroneous. He was generally addressed by those approaching his age by the name of "Lincoln," only; while we of the younger men who were occasionally with him always addressed him as "Mr. Lincoln," with the proper deference. It is probable that with his more intimate friends of New Salem and Springfield, the familiar nickname may have been made use of; but what these pages profess to tell is of his life upon the circuit and upon the stump. It is certain that in the descriptions of his great debates with Judge Douglas, who had known him before then many years and intimately, no justification is found for the claim made in favor of this low familiarity on the part of his associates.

Some instances of the demeanor of Mr. Lincoln falling under the observation of the writer will well illustrate how naturally, and at all times and without seeming thought or effort, he met the people upon the same level upon which he and they had been bred, may not be out of point.

On the day preceding the now celebrated Bloomington Convention, held at Bloomington, on May 29, 1856, it having been the first state gathering of the elements which, when united, formed the Republican party of Illinois, Mr. Lincoln was in attendance upon the Circuit Court at Danville, in Eastern Illinois, but with the determination to attend this call and with an intense desire that the convention should not be a failure for the want of numbers. The week previous he had attended the same Court at Urbana, Judge David Davis presiding at both. He had talked the matter of the coming convention with political friends in both counties; and on that day, with quite a following from both Vermilion and Champaign counties, mostly

of young men and sympathizers, of whom the writer was one, was upon his way to Bloomington. His route led the company by the Wabash Railroad to Decatur, and thence, by the Illinois Central Railroad, to Bloomington. We arrived at Decatur about the middle of the afternoon, but too late for a train to our destination that day, making a stay there over night necessary. The afternoon and evening were to be disposed of in some way; and, as was his custom when leisure permitted, he said to our crowd, "Boys, let us go to the woods." This was assented to, and, led by him, we went down to the timber belt then skirting the Sangamon River, half a mile away. There we arrived, and were soon seated upon the body of a fallen tree, lying near the road in a thicket of brush. For some hours in the shade and suitably situated for recreation, we remained in conversation, mostly upon the topic uppermost in the minds of all, the coming convention and its results; but also listening to Lincoln's stories and quaint expressions. His manner with his young followers that long afternoon was as intimate and informal as if he had again met there the young men and boys of New Salem, and was again entertaining them with his drolleries. The occasion was one in which he exhibited what some one has called his "grand ungainliness." His interest in the coming convention and its outcome occupied most of his attention, and seemed to be upon his mind, but other and familiar topics were talked.

The next day at the convention, to which further reference is hereafter made, which proved one of great interest and was in fact an important epoch in the state history, he met the foremost men of the old Whig party, with whom he had in the past years always gone down to defeat, politically; as well as many prominent Democrats, who were in a state of revolt against Judge Douglas's leadership; also men of the former Anti-

slavery party, a mass of men as yet disunited and in a measure discordant, except upon the one idea of opposition to the extension of slavery into the territories, made possible by the late legislation in Congress, for which they held Douglas responsible.

In this gathering, Lincoln, probably for the first time in his life, showed his great qualities of leadership. It was not the leadership of the mere politician, but that generalship which at once takes into consideration the end to be accomplished in the future, the material available, and the immediate and remote obstacles to be overcome. The odds and ends of the old parties not in sympathy with Douglas were at hand and available if fusion was possible. In the way of a complete union were certain old issues of the old parties, now latent to a hopeful extent, and the intense horror of the conservative element of the epithet *abolitionist*! But Douglas had in a manner helped in this, for he had long since, and in every speech made by him, called them all "*Black Republicans*," the sting of which had in two years partly worn off. The work of fusion was well accomplished by the contact of mind with mind, and the discovery of the fact that they were one upon the only issue which would divide parties at the coming national election; and an acceptable declaration of principles was agreed upon. A ticket drawn from all elements represented, headed by Colonel William H. Bissell for Governor, was put before the people. Mr. Lincoln himself was made head of the electoral ticket, and really led the party to a triumphant success so far as the state ticket was concerned, though Mr. Buchanan carried the electoral election. This was the first time in the history of the State of Illinois when a Governor was elected not of the party of Judge Douglas.

The contrast between the conduct of the Lincoln of May 28,

on the train *en route* to Bloomington and upon the log in the Sangamon woods, in company with his young partisan followers,—plebeian in demeanor, gay, story-telling, and common in every respect,—and the Lincoln in his appearance and actions before the convention, the moving spirit in a mass of unorganized but zealous men whom it was desirable to unite in a common purpose in behalf of a great movement of the nation for humanity, was a revelation of his true character and power! There, by his mastery of the situation and his moving eloquence, he made himself a state leader, as he became six years thereafter a national leader! In the former attitude he was a boy among boys, his equals there! In the latter he was a leader of leaders among men in a great and untried contest, in which he successfully mobilized discordant elements into a united party and led the men forth harmonious and to conquest!

Here for the first time, it is claimed, Mr. Lincoln exhibited the qualities of leadership which during the great Rebellion he proved himself to possess in so eminent a degree. Those only who know the wide breach which before 1856 separated the Whigs and Democrats of Illinois from the Anti-slavery party, which had no existence in that State save in the northern counties, and were universally known by the offensive epithet of "*abolitionists*," can understand the real difficulties of the task undertaken and accomplished at Bloomington. That O. H. Browning, John M. Palmer, John Wentworth, and Archibald Williams, representative men of the old parties, should affiliate and co-labor in a political campaign with Owen Lovejoy, President Blanchard, and Ichabod Coddington, upon a well-defined platform of principles, based upon opposition to the spread of slavery in the territories, leaving out of sight the moral aspects of that institution where it had legal existence, as well as the debatable questions in economics which before then had

always divided the Whig and Democratic parties, was the anomaly and wonder of the day! It is no less so at this time, with those who survive and understand the then situation! The men who constituted that convention having mostly passed away, it is now recognized that to the initiative genius and generalship of Lincoln was it all due. The conclusion is the correct one.

In October, 1858, and during the contest between himself and Judge Douglas, Mr. Lincoln had an appointment to speak at the Fair Ground at Urbana. He came to the grounds at the head of an immense delegation of citizens, in wagons and upon horseback, which had met him at the railroad station. His friends among the ladies in charge of the tables where the inevitable barbecue of all political gatherings of that day was to be served to the people at the noon hour, had prepared for him and for his immediate attendants a place at the head of the tables, where the best of the feast had been placed for his use. He was met at the gate and escorted to the place prepared for him at the head of the tables, and was seated and engaged in disposing of his dinner, when his eye fell upon an old woman standing not far away and looking intently at him. He at once, recognizing the woman, asked her, "Why, Gran-ny," a name by which he and others were in the habit of calling her, "have you no place to eat your dinner?" He had known her as a waiter and helper about the hotel where he had been in the habit of stopping. The woman answered him that she did not want dinner, "Just wanted to see you, Mr. Lincoln." He would not have it so, but said, "You must have a place, here; come and take my place." This the old lady persistently refused, until he arose and made her take his seat at the table while he, with his turkey leg, and bread and butter, sat down upon the ground at the foot of a near-by tree, and

there finished his luncheon. This done, he took his place in the speakers' stand before a large audience, where Judge Douglas had the day before spoken, and for an hour and a half in his trenchant and plain manner, which all could understand, exposed the fallacies of "Squatter Sovereignty," under the Dred Scott decision.

Some censorious critic may draw satisfaction in saying that the event of giving his seat to this humble woman was a piece of "acting," for effect. Not so. In his feelings towards his fellow-creatures, Lincoln knew no such thing as caste. His chivalrous feelings towards woman did the rest!

Some years since, as the writer was passing the residence of a neighbor, an elderly lady of Urbana, an old resident there, who was an acquaintance of Mr. Lincoln, one known to him as an emigrant from one of the Southern States, he found her in the garden upon her knees, gathering herbs for a mess of "greens." A familiar salutation as to her occupation caused her to look up from under her sun-bonnet with the exclamation, "I was just thinking of Lincoln. Once he came along when I was gathering greens in the spring, back in the fifties, as I am now, and said to me, 'That's right, Mrs. K., get plenty of greens, and I will come and take dinner with you.'" She further said that Mr. Lincoln, at the noon hour, did come and take dinner with her family, and said she, "And you ought to have seen him eat the greens and bacon!"

These incidents are narrated to illustrate the habitual simplicity of the thoughts and character of the man. He never sought to cast behind him, as something to be discarded and forgotten with its associations, that life to which he was born and reared. It and his surroundings in his childhood and young manhood, as he well knew, had for him no lessons in jurisprudence or statecraft, and served no purpose, other than

to minister to his democratic and agrarian instincts and tastes.

As a lawyer in the Supreme Court and upon the circuit, he associated with such brilliant minds as Judges Treat and Davis, Leonard Swett, Usher F. Linder, O. B. Ficklin, E. D. Baker, O. L. Davis, and William D. Somers, some of whom reached high positions in political and professional life, all of whom were deep students of legal and classical literature, which encouraged in him the cultivation of the logical and measured style of language used by him in conversation, in his addresses, and in his published papers. His style of expression the ablest critics have deferred to as faultless.

As above briefly pictured, with the exception of three terms as a member of the legislative body of Illinois and one term as a member of the lower house of Congress, Mr. Lincoln spent his life up to and until the year 1854, when he had attained the age of forty-five. This date, so pivotal in the life of the nation, was in his life no less important. At this time Senator Douglas, an early and successful opponent, by his discovery of the misfit doctrine of "Squatter Sovereignty," furnished the opportunity for the passing of Lincoln from a mediocre life to the eminence which the world recognizes.

The logical effect of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which that year became a law, was not only to organize unoccupied territory into inchoate states of the Federal family, but to pave the way for the unannounced "Dred Scott" decision of the Supreme Court. In appearance and according to the explanation of Douglas, it was a kind of local option, as applied to human slavery. It in effect said, Let each territory and state determine for itself whether or not it will enslave and make chattels of one part of its inhabitants, who must spend their lives and devote their offspring for the benefit of the dominating class. It had in its favor a corruption of the principle uppermost in

the American mind, that all power is inherent in the people, and that a majority of that people must control; but it fatally ignored the rights of the minority, and failed to limit the power of the majority within the bounds of human freedom and equal rights. Whenever local option attempts to set up a system which goes beyond the limits of morality, and fosters a condition of immorality; or when it interferes with the right of every man to "eat the bread his own hands have earned," it becomes subversive of the ends of human government. This in effect the new discovery did. The wrong could be read between the lines of that law, and so was read by Lincoln while "on the circuit." His incisive intellect saw the vulnerable point in the coat of mail with which Douglas had clothed himself, and, like Goliath of old, had walked forth upon the plains of Illinois, and with words of defiance challenged the hosts of abolitionism to battle. Lincoln was the unknown David of that day. To the challenge of the "Little Giant," "Choose you a man for you, and let him come down to me," he came forth, and, laying aside the armor and political toggery of Whiggery with which his old associates would have encumbered him, he "chose him five smooth stones out of the brook,"—the simple life, human rights, truth, consistency, and plain talk,—and, going forth with the sling of his unclouded intellect, accepted the challenge of the boastful giant.

The Philistine chieftain "disdained" the champion of the army of right. No less than this did Judge Douglas to Lincoln, when in effect he said to him, "Am I a dog, that thou comest to me with staves?" When Douglas at Galesburg, an anti-slavery town, threatened, when he had led Lincoln down into Egypt, to warp him to destruction, he, no less than the Philistine, in effect said to his humble adversary, "Come to me, and I will give thy flesh unto the fowls of the air, and to the beasts of the field!"

The scriptural parallel may be further invoked, for Lincoln, in reply to Douglas's boastful demeanor, in effect said, "Thou comest to me with a sword and with a spear, and with a shield: but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied!"

The termination of both contests above referred to was similar! Truth, though championed by humble agents, will always prevail!

Recurring to the date, 1854. Lincoln first attacked Douglas's new discovery in a speech at Springfield, delivered on October 3, the next day after one by Douglas at the state house. This was followed by another at Peoria on October 16, and on October 24 at Urbana. To the latter the writer for the first time listened to a political address from Mr. Lincoln. This speech was in fact the third in which he had purposely attacked the aggressiveness of slavery, and indirectly at least the institution itself. The writer, then fresh from the influences and radicalism of a childhood training in Northern Ohio, and Oberlin, was impatient at the reserve with which the speaker handled the slavery question, he scarcely alluding to its moral phases; but, basing his objections to the then late legislation in Congress, upon the fact that in the territory affected by it slavery had once and for a consideration been excluded and it solemnly dedicated to freedom, he ignored all moral questions. He there exhibited none of the freedom of criticism of the system and of its influence upon the nation which characterized his later utterances in 1856 and 1858. The reasons for this were afterwards obvious. He was then addressing, not an audience of Ohio radicals, but one, as he well knew, made up mostly of men who had never listened to an anti-slavery address, and who were alarmed at the name of *abolitionist*, being mostly immigrants from slaveholding states. Largely they were the old Whig friends and adherents of Lincoln, whom he

was seeking to win as allies against this new, and by its plausibility misleading, doctrine. To have dealt with the slavery question then as he did four years thereafter, when engaged in the contest with his adversary, would have been at once to drive from him these old friends of his to the Douglas standard. He well knew the situation and its dangers at that period.

From what has been learned of the actual sentiments of Mr. Lincoln as indicated by some of his earlier and unguarded expressions, at that time and for many years before then, his real convictions upon the moral phases of the slavery question underwent no changes from the episode in political affairs which called him forth in 1854. He long before then saw and appreciated the wrongs against humanity permitted by it, but was restrained from giving utterance to his convictions.

At the Bloomington convention of May 29, 1856, above referred to, he spoke under the same guarded limitations as at Urbana, in 1854. The time had not yet come for the full utterance of his convictions. There too he had before him an aggregation of former Democrats and Whigs who as yet held but one sentiment in common, that of opposition to the legislation promoted by Senator Douglas, whom he hoped, by wise manipulation, to unite in an effective opposition. With them was also another element, the anti-slavery men from the northern counties, of the Lovejoy and Coddington variety, willing and anxious for a coalition with the former, but whose radicalism was to the others as a red flag held before a wild bull! The Whigs and Democrats, bred to a dislike for each other, were united in a dislike for the anti-slavery men which amounted in some cases to abhorrence! Lincoln was the last speaker of the day, Whigs, Democrats and Free-soilers having in turn had their innings. The then anarchy prevailing in Kansas, the legitimate fruit of the legislation complained of, was most largely

the theme for all speakers who preceded him. Fresh news that day received of the most exciting and aggravating character, together with the actual presence at the convention, as speakers, of the expelled Governor Reeder and other exiles from that territory, gave to all speakers a text from which to enlarge, and the topic had well been worked over, all alike condemning the policy of the administration in its dealings with the vexed question, the intensity in the case of each speaker depending upon the fact of his former party affiliations. Conservative men only counseled abiding by law methods, while those more radical even justified a resort to extreme measures, in which Sharpe's rifles were recommended.

After the settlement of the question of a platform and of candidates, Mr. Lincoln, who had until then been busy in the committees, was called to the platform, and was indeed needed in order that the excitement, then at the fever heat, be allayed. With a coolness that contrasted with that of the convention, he began his address with a mild but well-understood rebuke of the counseled force of previous speakers, telling his audience to "Wait until November, and then to shoot paper ballots at them." Having administered an effective sedative to his audience, he entered upon a most logical and convincing arraignment of Senator Douglas and the administration of Mr. Buchanan for the condition approaching war between the sections then prevailing in Kansas, quite suggestive of an approaching national climax. He compared the then condition of affairs in the country with that which preceded the legislation of 1854, and charged the unfortunate change, which then threatened consequences so direful, to the ambitions of Douglas! Particularly did he deplore what the South even then threatened, disunion of the States, and in the severest terms denounced the growing sentiment looking to that condition of

national affairs which five years thereafter became effective!

His arguments left for his hearers no other conclusion than that a working union of all parties opposed to Douglas and his ticket, before then placed in the field, must be effected. In this speech no allusion was made which could alarm his conservative friends from the southern part of the State, while the other element from the north end were delighted and encouraged to find so able and logical an advocate against the aggressions of slavery.

At that time the term "Republican," as a party designation, had been but little used in Illinois, and that by the free-soil element only. The convention had been called as an "Anti-Nebraska Convention"; and by this designation only from an abundance of caution, did Lincoln allude to it in his speech. He wisely knew that his conservative friends had gathered there, not purposely to commit themselves to whatever might be brought forth by the gathering, but rather with a mental reservation which would permit their support or opposition to its work, according as they might see it when completed; and that to alarm them might start a stampede which would result in complete defeat. Hence his caution and moderation.

As elsewhere indicated, the events and results of this memorable convention firmly fixed the position of Mr. Lincoln as the leader of the new party in Illinois. His ability, wisdom, and moderation well marked him as the man to lead the opposition to Senator Douglas, and this, from this time henceforth, he did, by unanimous approval.

Douglas and Lincoln as competitors in the political field began their contests many years before this, when both were but beginners in the profession of the law in adjoining counties, and were likewise both members of the legislative body. Few of the state campaigns which took place between the years

1836 and 1860 but they contested upon the same territory for personal and political success, besides contending together in behalf of clients in the Supreme and Circuit courts. It was no new experience with them when, in 1858, by the action of their parties, they were made the champions for each upon the only issue which at that day divided them. Each knew the other thoroughly, and both entered the contest with a full knowledge of what he had to meet. Douglas had the advantage in having at all times before 1860 met with success, except in one contest, that for a seat in the Lower House of Congress, for he became Attorney-General for the State at the age of twenty-two; a judge of the Supreme Court at the age of twenty-eight; a member of Congress at the age of thirty; a United States Senator at the age of thirty-three, and a formidable candidate for the presidency at the age of thirty-nine. Before that age he had a well-earned reputation as an able politician in national affairs, while Mr. Lincoln had, until 1860, been with the losing party in his state, and had been a principal actor in its many defeats.

These contests between the champions which began upon and for so many years raged over the prairies of Illinois, and which have given to the political and historical literature of the country some of its brightest pages, ended, as every school-boy knows, at the doors of the White House, with Lincoln as the successful one at last, and with Douglas at death's door, for he passed away within five months after taking part in the inauguration of President Lincoln, having with his dying breath spoken patriotic words of cheer and encouragement to his successful rival in his encounter with secession and rebellion, which had been hastened perhaps by their contest in Illinois.

It is claimed above that to the personal peculiarities in the character of Mr. Lincoln, a love of justice, and a conscientious

adherence to truth, he owed his final success. All this he possessed in his earlier life, when he actively advocated the economic doctrines of the Whig party and when he always went down to defeat. But when, in addition to this, his lips had been touched with the fires from humanity's altar, and he became the champion of human freedom, he triumphed, once for all, over his rival, and the world looked upon him with wonder and delight!

ARTICLE IV.

THE REAL DATE ¹ OF THE GOSPELS.

BY THE REVEREND PARKE P. FLOURNOY, D.D., BETHESDA,
MARYLAND.

DOCTOR SANDAY, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in Oxford University, who is very generally regarded as among the first, if not the very first, of English scholars in New Testament criticism, asserts in his "Criticism of the Fourth Gospel" that "those who attempted to write what we wrongly call 'Lives of Christ' did not, as it would seem, for the most part, begin to do so, or make preparations for beginning, for some thirty years after the crucifixion" (p. 217).

This may be said to be the opinion not only of Dr. Sanday, but of nearly all of the most distinguished New Testament scholars of the present time. But, may we not ask, What is the reason for supposing that this long period of delay was allowed to pass before recording the words and deeds of Christ?—words and deeds of more importance than any others which history has preserved. In view of the great array of discoveries which show the prevalence of the practice of writing in the time of Christ and in the apostolic age ² by unlearned people, the question is surely a reasonable one.

¹ "Date," instead of "dates," is used advisedly, as will be seen.

² "That the whole practice of government and law at an early time was based on the rule that everything must be written down at the moment, e.g. that all sales and conveyances of property must be registered in writing,—all this has been revealed in recent years, not in literary evidence, but by finding the actual documents." (Sir William M. Ramsay, *Trans. Victoria Institute*, vol. xxxix. p. 203.)

These discoveries have thrown a flood of light on the peculiarities of the Greek of the New Testament, showing that it is the Greek of the people and not that of classical literature. The same sort of Greek is found on the papyri and ostraka of these times. Those who have read Professor Adolf Deissmann's articles on "New Light on the New Testament Greek," or his lectures delivered in 1907 at Cambridge University, know how general was the practice of writing in Greek at this period among all classes of society, and that this writing on all matters of business and common interest among Greek-speaking people was in a Greek very much like that of the New Testament. This being so, we naturally ask why the apostles and immediate followers of Christ should be supposed to have deferred committing to writing what they knew about Christ, and what he taught them, till more than thirty years after the crucifixion, when people of their own class were writing, all around them, on all matters which concerned them? It is true, Peter and John were considered "ignorant and unlearned men" by the Sanhedrin; but, as has been well said, this was from the standpoint of rabbinical learning. Their writings of a later date show that they were by no means unable to write, and to write with great force—one of them having written as no man, inspired or uninspired, has ever written, before or since.¹ God chose the instruments for making the record concerning his Son, in accordance with their fitness for the great work, and the particular part of it committed to each, as is seen in the distinctly marked individuality of the different writers. No one holds that the ability to write was given by inspiration, and if the Evangelists had the ability to write at

¹ "The utterance of one of those rare souls who speak with timeless voice to the permanent wants of man." (James Drummond, *Authorship and Character of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 28.)

the later date usually assigned for the writing of the Gospels, they had it at an earlier time.

The reasons given for the supposed late production of the Gospels are three: (1) Tradition (Eusebius, H. E. v. 8; iii. 24); (2) No need of written Gospels while the apostles were still giving their oral testimony; (3) That we have no quotations from, nor references to, written Gospels at an earlier date.

Support for the first and second of these reasons is supposed to be furnished by Eusebius, who states that Matthew wrote his Gospel when he was leaving the Hebrews (H. E. iii. 24), to go to other nations.

Whatever weight this tradition may have as to the Matthean *authorship* of the first Gospel (and it undoubtedly has much), the *date* of its composition is not settled by it. For one thing, we do not know at what date Matthew left Palestine; and then, while a universal tradition as to the *authorship* of a book may be entirely reliable, a tradition as to the circumstances of its production may be very much less so.

As to the *need* of written records, we must remember how many nations were represented at the Pentecost after the crucifixion, and how widely Christianity spread among them during that generation. In view of this progress of the gospel in many countries, it certainly seems reasonable to suppose that something more definite than oral tradition was needed, especially among heathen recently turned from their false religions, to prevent fatal mistakes about the most vital of facts. Personal witnesses of the deeds and words of Christ could remain with churches founded by them for but a short time, as they would have to go on to the regions beyond. As the work progressed and churches were multiplied in various countries, "native workers" following the first missionaries as instructors of the new converts thus left behind, it would seem to have

been imperatively necessary to have written records about Him in whom they believed, and in whom was all their hope of salvation. These records, supposing there were such, were not, probably, in the form of completeness which they took under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, suiting them for all following ages, but suitable for meeting the needs of that time. Indeed, the prologue of Luke's Gospel opens a window on the scene through which we catch a glimpse of "many" authors who drew up such narratives to meet the universal need. It can hardly be claimed, then, that there *was* no need of written records during all this generation succeeding the crucifixion, and Luke's Gospel furnishes proof that earlier narratives had been drawn up before this one, more complete, and fitted for use in all future ages, was written.

While "many" were drawing up narratives, is it reasonable to suppose that the apostles, Matthew and John, who were personal witnesses of all that was to be told of Christ, refrained from writing memoranda of these things?

As to the third reason for believing that none of our Gospels was written till near the fall of Jerusalem, namely, that there are no quotations of them in literature of an earlier date, it is sufficient to answer, that we *have* no literature of that time which would be likely to contain such quotations. That part of the New Testament which follows the Gospels does so in a perfectly natural way in the treatment of the great theme. The Acts, Epistles, and Revelation all presuppose what is told us in the Gospels. Without what the Gospels contain, these books would be incomprehensible—without a foundation, like a house hanging in the air. We know, approximately, the dates of most of these writings, and it is plain to every unsophisticated reader that those who wrote them had accurate knowledge of the great facts of Christ's life, death, and resurrection which

we find recorded in the four Gospels.¹ Not only is this so, but it is evident that those to whom the Epistles were *written* were familiar with the cardinal facts of the gospel history. They could not have been understood by them without such knowledge.

Among the last utterances of the late Professor Blass of Halle is the expression of his conviction that "Paul himself was certainly in possession of some sort of records." He was convinced, from his researches, too, that "a copy of a Gospel nearly as long as that of Mark had come to Alexandria about A.D. 49," and remarks, "It may have actually been the Gospel of Mark." May not the "books" and "parchments," like the "cloak" left with Carpus at Troas, have been part of Paul's missionary outfit? May they not have been some of those "narratives" of which Luke, his companion in evangelistic labor, speaks? There is no more natural supposition than that they were such "memoirs of the apostles and their followers" as Justin Martyr speaks of—the records of some who followed Christ in his ministry, and could give personal testimony to the great facts of his life, his death, his resurrection, and his ascension.

Though most modern critics, following the lead of Harnack and Zahn of Erlangen, agree substantially with Dr. Sanday as to the date of the Gospels, there are distinguished exceptions. Dr. Bernhard Weiss, after mentioning that Eusebius, in his "Chronicon," "puts the composition of Matthew's Gospel in the year 41," though his history seems to imply a change of

¹ It is proper to notice here that the First Epistle of John, which is later, as all agree, than the Synoptic Gospels, does not contain a single quotation from them. Why, then, should it be held that these Gospels could not have been in existence when Paul wrote his Epistles, because these Epistles are not full of quotations from the Gospels? But, the gospel facts underlie all Paul's Epistles, as they do the Epistle of John.

view, states that "of late Plitt, Hengelfeld and others go back to the fifties," and Blass states confidently that "Peter left Jerusalem for good in A.D. 47 or 48, and the other disciples at the same time or earlier," and says, "Therefore we may date the first written records for Judea about A.D. 48."

John's Gospel, as is quite generally agreed, was written later than the Synoptics, as Eusebius states, and is generally assigned to the decade 90-100 A.D. Yet Blass, who believes in his traditional residence in Asia Minor, would place it much earlier. Dates are often indicated by means of things mentioned without any such purpose as that of indicating the time of writing. For instance, in John v. 2 we read, "Now there is in Jerusalem by the sheep gate a pool which is called in Hebrew Bethesda, having five porches." This is said not to settle a date, but to indicate the locality in which a miracle was performed. Yet many think that it *does* indicate that the Gospel of John was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. After that event, John could hardly have spoken of the pool and the porches as still in existence. Bengel, in his commentary on the passage, uses these words: "*Ecce, there is.* John wrote before the destruction of the city. *There is*, saith he, not *there was*, a pool. Even then there was remaining with his hearers a recollection of the treasury, a place in the temple: ch. viii. 20. 'These words spake Jesus in the treasury as He taught in the temple.' In agreement with this are those of the ancients who set down this book as edited 30, 31, or 32 years after the ascension of our Lord."

This view is held not only by the "ancients"; but we learn from the *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, June, 1906, pp. 819 ff., that "Gebhart accepts the main conclusion [of Wuttig] that the Fourth Gospel and the first Epistle were written before the fall of Jerusalem." The force of the words "There is in Jerusalem" may be made to appear by a very simple illus-

tration. There was in the city of Washington forty years ago a rather unsightly object, an incomplete monument to the father of our country. It stood there many years in this condition, to the shame of the American people, the subject of much jeering and poor wit. But at last it began to rise, and by 1885 the aluminum cap (on the capstone) was brought forth with rejoicing. The monument was finished, and is now the pride and not the reproach of the nation. Now, if an undated letter of some well-known person were found in which it was said, that "there is in Washington, south of the White House, a half-finished monument to George Washington," every one who knew the facts of the case would feel entirely certain that this letter was written at least fifteen years before the beginning of the twentieth century.

There seems to be no expression in either the Gospel or First Epistle of John which is inconsistent with its production before the fall of Jerusalem. The discussions with the Jews, it has been noticed, would seem to indicate that the part of the Gospel containing them was written not forty years after they were uttered, but even, the writer in the Review thinks, while John still abode in Palestine. He also sees an indication that other apostles were still living when the Gospel and Epistle were written, "and were associated with the writer in the witness which he bears to Jesus as the Christ." Expressions such as "That which *we* have heard," etc., are referred to. He thinks, also, that there are external evidences which are reliable, as "Many ancient versions and glosses are at one in maintaining that the Fourth Gospel was written in the time of Nero, that is, before the year 68. A number of Greek manuscripts assign it definitely to 30 or 32 years after the ascension of our Lord. Cf. Drummond, *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 67, note."

Now Eusebius (vi. 14) quotes from Clement of Alexandria

as follows: "Last of all, John, perceiving that the bodily [external] facts had been set forth in the other Gospels, at the instance of his disciples, and with the indication of the Spirit, composed a spiritual Gospel."

There is no reason to doubt the assertion here that the Gospel of John was written later than the Synoptics, and the character of the Gospel is in full keeping with it. Indeed, very few have doubted that the Fourth Gospel was written after the three others.

If, then, the Fourth Gospel was written before the fall of Jerusalem (an event, which, if it had occurred, would almost certainly have been mentioned in it, or at least have left some unmistakable trace in it), the great difference in the presentation of the work of redemption in this Gospel and the others would indicate a much earlier origin for them than is generally conceded.

Almost every thoughtful reader must have noticed the great difference between John's Gospel and the other three. These present to a great extent a different class of facts and different discourses from those which we find in John's Gospel, which seems designed for readers maturer in knowledge of the person, character, and work of Christ, and this may be taken as an indication of its later date. John seems to have been specially chosen for this work and furnished with those mental and spiritual endowments which were necessary for its performance.

Dr. Sanday, speaking of the promise of the Holy Spirit, in John xiv. 25-27; xv. 26, 27; and xvi. 13, 14, remarks: "It might be said that these passages are a summary sketch of the mental history of the Evangelist from the day of Pentecost onward"; and, as to that class of teachings which characterize the Gospel of John, says: "It is teaching of a kind that might

perhaps haunt the minds of a few gifted and far-sighted individuals, but would certainly fall through the meshes of the mind of the average man."

Now, whether the Gospel of John was written, in its complete and final form, in the last quarter of the first century, or in the last decade of it, or in the decade preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, as a small minority of critics think, does not much matter as to the main contention of this paper. However this may have been, we may confidently believe that the Gospels are not only the testimony of contemporaries of Christ, but that they contain contemporary testimony of him. The testimony of a contemporary witness may be testimony by no means contemporary. Lapses of memory, and the unconscious working of the imagination, may warp it very far from what it would have been if delivered immediately on the occurrence of the events which are related. I believe that the promise of the Holy Spirit to bring all things to their remembrance, and lead them into all truth, was kept, and that the testimony of the Evangelists was not transformed by the lapse of time or lapses of memory. This might have been accomplished without the use of the pen or with it. Alford thought it was without writing immediately. The use by the Synoptists of the same words and phrases, he thought, could be explained by supposing that these were so frequently used in oral discourse that they became the natural vehicle of the relation of the events. He recognizes the existence too of some contemporary records.

Alford summarizes his views given in his Greek Testament (Prolegomena, chap. i.) in the following words: "That the Synoptic Gospels contain the substance of the apostolic testimony, collected principally from their oral teachings current in the church—partly, also, from written documents embodying

portions of that teaching; that there is, however, no reason, from their internal structure, to believe, but every reason to disbelieve, that any one of the three Evangelists had access to either of the other two Gospels in its present form." "The common substratum of apostolic teaching" he believed to have been "the original source of the common part of the three Gospels."

He sharply distinguishes this from ordinary oral tradition thus: "The oral tradition (or rather oral teaching) with which we are concerned, formed the substance of a deliberate and careful testimony to facts of the highest possible importance, and as such was inculcated in daily catechization; whereas, common oral tradition is careless and vague, not being similarly guarded, nor diffused as matter of earnest instruction."

As to the theory, almost universally adopted by critics at present, that the Gospel of Mark was the chief "source" of Matthew and Luke, Dr. Sanday expresses the generally received view of the relations of the Synoptic Gospels and their time of production thus: "I do not doubt that the most active period for the putting together materials for the Gospels was the decade 60-70 A.D. At the beginning of this period St. Mark had not yet taken up his task; and his Gospel forms the basis of the other two Synoptics. The Matthaean *Logia* perhaps were by this time collected" (*Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 217). "Of course," he says, "the fundamental text is that of St. Mark" (p. 153).¹

Dean Alford more than doubted the truth of the theory that one Evangelist borrowed from another. He remarks: "It is

¹ Professor F. C. Burkitt, of Cambridge University, in his *Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 38, uses such language as this: "It is now enough to say that the relative priority of Mark is now ac-

inconceivable that one writer, borrowing from another matter confessedly of the very first importance, *in good faith and approval*, should alter his diction so singularly and capriciously as, *on this hypothesis*, we find the text of the parallel sections of our Gospels altered."

We should remember, too, that the improbability that *one* author should be found copying and altering in this capricious way is small compared with that of *two* doing the same thing and with different alterations.

A writer in the *Review and Expositor* for July, 1907, Joseph Palmer, of New South Wales, is equally opposed to the theory so generally held, that Matthew's and Luke's Gospels are drawn largely from Mark's; and, as a test, compares two parallel passages from the two Gospels, Mark i. 21-28 and Luke iv. 31-37,—two passages remarkably alike—and shows the unreasonableness of the supposition that one was copied from the other.

If we compare parallel passages *in all three* of the Synoptics, I think we can see very plainly the unlikelihood of such a process. The first set I happened to turn to as a test impressed me in this way. They were the three accounts of the appointment of the twelve apostles,

MATT. X. 2-4.

Now the names of the twelve apostles are these: The first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother; Phillip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew the publican; James the son of Alphæus, and Thaddeus. This list is accepted almost as an axiom by the great majority of scholars who occupy themselves with Gospel problems."

For discussions on the two sides of this question, the reader is referred to W. C. Allen's commentary on Matthew in the International Critical Commentary in favor of the Markan theory, and the article of Arthur Carr, M.A., on the Authenticity, etc., of the First Gospel, in the *Expositor* for October, 1907, in reply.

dæus; Simon the Cananæan, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.

MARK III. 13-19.

And he goeth up into the mountain and calleth unto him whom he himself would: and they went unto him. And he appointed twelve, that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out demons: And Simon he surnamed Peter; and James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and them he surnamed Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder; and Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the son of Alphæus, and Thaddæus, and Simon the Cananæan, and Judas Iscariot, which also betrayed him.

LUKE VI. 12-16.

And it came to pass in these days that he went into the mountain to pray, and he continued all night in prayer to God. And when it was day, he called his disciples: and he chose from them twelve, whom also he named apostles; Simon, (whom he also named Peter,) and Andrew his brother, and James and John, and Philip and Bartholomew, and Matthew and Thomas, and James the son of Alphæus, and Simon, which is called the Zealot, and Judas the brother of James, and Judas Iscariot, which was the traitor.

Matthew's account, it will be seen, is not the *appointment*, which, however, is implied; but the *sending forth* of the twelve apostles, and is introduced by suggesting the reason for it. It was this: "And when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted and were scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd" (ix. 36). And he exhorted his disciples to pray that laborers be sent forth. Mark speaks of the appointment, and tells of the preparation for it in his withdrawing to the mountain and calling to himself a select number of his followers, from whom he chose twelve. Luke speaks of another most important part of this preparation: "He continued all night in prayer, and when it was day, he called his disciples, and he chose from them twelve." This, surely is not copying. If there ever were three accounts of the same occurrence, independent of each other,

and each throwing some additional light on it, I think we have an instance here. When we come to the list of the twelve we find them called apostles, by all three; Peter is, in all, placed first and Judas Iscariot last. The fact that the last is the traitor is included in all. These are things we should naturally expect in each account; but look at the difference in the grouping, and the difference in the phraseology in speaking of the traitor and in the giving of the surnames. There is no copying here.

In the words of the last writer named, "What reason could there be for making alterations of such a character? That the alterations, if they be alterations, are not due to carelessness, is proved by the exact agreement between the narratives in all details of fact."

Dean Alford's supposition of the knowledge among the Christians of that generation of the "common substratum of apostolic teaching" seems a much more probable explanation, both of the identities and of the differences of these accounts, each of which has a distinct character of its own, and reflects the individuality of its author.

But the writer in the *Expositor and Review* takes an important step in advance of Alford which he feels fully warranted in doing by later discoveries as to the character of the Greek used among the people of the apostolic age. He feels sure that our Saviour, reared from childhood in "Galilee of the Gentiles," used this Greek as well as Aramaic, and that his apostles, who were of the same region, did the same. He thinks that accounts of some of the remarkable occurrences were written down immediately or very soon after they took place, and that notes of discourses and parables were taken as they were uttered; that some of these were spoken in Greek—the Greek of the people—the Greek of the New Testament, and some in

Aramaic; and that John preserves for us in his Gospel a selection chiefly from those spoken in Greek, while the Synoptists made their Gospels chiefly, so far as discourses are concerned, from those delivered in Aramaic. The bilingual and trilingual inscriptions which have come to light in our days are suggestive here.

He thinks that though, as Luke says, "*many*" may "have taken in hand to draw up a narrative," the four Evangelists, two as apostles and eye-witnesses, and two under apostolic guidance and with apostolic approval, wrote on the basis of the contemporary records, some of which were their own writings, and some, those of other witnesses.

It must be plain to every one who reads the Gospels or any other books of the Scriptures that inspiration does not deprive the writers of their individuality. The supernatural "power" given them does not supersede the natural powers with which they have been gifted. In connection with the supernatural power exercised in miracles we find that natural means are not set aside. Christ said, "Lazarus, come forth"; but said to those standing by, "Loose him, and let him go," as He had already said, "Take away the stone." Doubtless He could have caused the stone to move, and the bandages to fall off, by his all-powerful word; but He let ordinary human agencies do what they could.

In the feeding of the thousands, He could, doubtless, have caused the loaves and fishes to float through the air to each receiving hand; but He gave them to his apostles and they distributed them. So, without doubt, our blessed Lord *could* have fulfilled his promise that the Holy Spirit should "bring all things to their remembrance" without the use of means: yet it would seem more in accord with his usual course that their natural powers should be used under the stimulation and

guidance of the Holy Spirit. The mention of their "remembrance," indeed, implies this; and why should that common aid to memory, writing, be excluded?

It has been well said, "A line written upon the spot is worth a cart-load of reminiscences." The vivid touches of the gospel records certainly would not impress one as made thirty or forty years after the occurrence of the deeds and scenes described. That "looking up into heaven" as He blessed the loaves and fishes is one of them: the "green grass" on which the multitude sat is another.

I am glad to be able to quote here the words of that accurate scholar and diligent searcher of facts, Sir William Ramsay, addressed to the Victoria Institute in London: "How few would venture to maintain that the Synoptic Gospels are, or might be, based on documents, some written while Christ was still living, some within a few days or hours of His death? *i.e.* [that] there were such documents in existence, accessible to persons who desired to attain 'to know the certainty of those things?' I feel no doubt that this was the case" (Trans., vol. xxxix.). Further on he says: "In the last few days I have printed an argument that about a sixth part of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, which is common to them, but is not found in the Gospel of Mark, is taken from a document written before the death of Christ." He remarks: "A history which ultimately rests partly on contemporary written evidence, partly on the evidence of eye-witnesses and actors in the events, stands on the highest plane of historic certainty." Professor Ramsay bases this belief as regards the Gospels on the innumerable discoveries which show the general prevalence of the custom of keeping records of all transactions of business—of writing "on the spot" and not trusting to memory. But, in showing that the Book of Acts "could not have been written in the second

century"—and he does it most conclusively—he adduces an argument of a different kind which is equally applicable to the Gospels, as records made earlier than the dates assigned by the great majority of New Testament scholars. These are his words: "The Book [Acts] could not have been written in the second century, as the later nineteenth century scholars declared it to be, because it is inconsistent with the situation in Asia Minor in the second century; it assumes conditions and relations that ceased to exist before the date when it was declared to have been fabricated; it is a document that is stamped as of the first century on the ordinary canons of criticism, and marked as originating from contemporary records by its vividness and individuality."

Harnack is quoted as saying of the Synoptic Gospels: "In their essential substance the Gospels belong to the first, the Jewish, aspect of Christianity, that brief epoch which may be denoted as the palæontological." Of unlearned readers, I think fully nine out of ten feel, if they never come to the point of expressing it in words, the same fact. It has been remarked of some of the opening sentences of some of Paul's Epistles, that a "whole system of theology" lies behind such expressions. Behind the narratives and recorded utterances of these Gospels, we feel that no such system lies; but that they are the seeds out of which such a system normally grew at a later stage in the development of inspired Christian thought. Yet according to the theory held even by conservative scholars, these Gospels were written after these Epistles of Paul. I cannot believe it without undeniable proof, of which, it can be safely asserted, there is none. The traditions repeated by Eusebius are not decisive as to matters like this, valuable as they are as to the broader fact of the *authorship* of the Gospels. We might have no doubt as to Bacon's authorship of the *Organon*, and

yet place very little confidence in any oral traditions as to the time or circumstances in which it was written.

Canon Gore (as he then was), writing in the *Pilot* in 1901, drew attention to some striking differences between the phraseology of the Gospels and that of the Epistles. In editorial comment, the *Expository Times* says: "Look at the phraseology of the Gospels first of all. In the Epistles, Christians are called 'the brethren' or 'the saints.' These titles describe their relations to the community. In the Gospels, as in the early history of the Acts, they are entitled 'the disciples.' Again, in the Gospels, the characteristic title of Jesus is 'the Son of Man,' and Christ is still the Jewish Messiah. In the Epistles, 'Christ' has become almost a proper name and 'the Son of Man' is no longer in use. . . . The phraseology of justification, sanctification and election, if it appears at all in the Gospels, appears so untechnically that the contrast is only the more impressive." After other differences are referred to, the remark is made: "It is difficult to imagine stronger evidence that the Gospels came into existence in the natural way described by St. Luke in his preface, and that they were left uncoloured by the thoughts and necessities of a later time."

If we take the opening verses of a later writing, the First Epistle of Peter, and compare the phraseology with that of the Gospel of Mark, we find the contrast equally striking. When we find Peter, there, speaking of Christians as "elect according to the foreknowledge of God, the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ," we are impressed with the fact that such doctrines as those of election, the Trinity, the atonement, with the fruit of "obedience" in the reconciled, and efficacious grace in salvation, were all familiar, not only to a few, but to those that were "scattered abroad" over many countries. "A whole system of

Theology," indeed, lies behind this; we have gotten far beyond the point of view of the Synoptic Gospels.

When we turn to the Gospel of Matthew, which a tradition tells us was written among the Hebrews and in their dialect,¹ "while Peter and Paul were laying the foundations of the church in Rome," we see no sign of such a system of theology lying behind the simple narrative, but feel that here are the *seeds* of which the system is the matured harvest. Many years of development must lie between the two, and we cannot but think the tradition a pure legend, so far as the time and circumstances of the record contained in the Gospel of Mark are concerned. Our inability to believe that the Gospel of Matthew was written "while Peter and Paul were laying the foundations of the church in Rome,"—a collaboration which many think fabulous—need not disturb our confidence in the Matthean authorship of the Gospel, to which all antiquity testifies. We may doubt the truth of the tradition that Shakespeare wrote "As You Like It," at a certain time, at a certain house; but none but a few literary cranks doubts that he wrote it.

The same tradition of Irenæus represents Mark as writing after the deaths of Peter and Paul. Whensoever the last touches may have been given to the Gospels, fitting them for use in all ages and for all nations, the whole style and point of view in them indicate the existence of contemporary records out of which they were formed. In Luke's case, these were the records of "many" who had "taken in hand to draw up a narrative," and in Mark's, may have been chiefly Peter's, and in the case of Matthew and John, their own diaries.

We cannot say just how it was done, as a matter of course. We can only consider the probabilities of the case in canvassing such questions as these: When "*many*" were making

¹ Iren. III. 1. 1, quoted by Eusebius, H. E. v. 8.

records, well may we ask, Is it likely that the Evangelists would have failed to do so? If they were to write these reminiscences of the most momentous events of the world's history for the interests of all humanity, is it likely that *their* pens would fail to move till some thirty or forty years after the events and utterances to be recorded? Is it likely that a whole generation of Christians would have been left without reliable written records, when their numbers were increasing so rapidly that personal testimony could not possibly be conveyed to the great majority of them? We all know how oral testimony, as it passes from mouth to mouth, takes on protean shapes, and is often entirely changed, not only in form but in substance. Would not vast numbers need, like Theophilus, to know "the certainty of these things" during this long formative period?

Such probabilities should certainly be considered in forming an opinion about such a matter.

Then look at the Gospels themselves. Do they bear the marks of a time when Christians could take in truths presented in the form we see in the Epistle to the Ephesians, for example? When we examine the Gospels and observe the great contrast of style, point of view, stage of development, and atmosphere, we can hardly fail to agree with Harnack when he says that, "In their essential substance, the Gospels belong to the first, the Jewish, aspect of Christianity."¹

"But," it is objected, "we have no literary proof, in the form of references to or quotations from the Gospels indicating their existence earlier than the decade 60-70 A.D." We may ask in reply, "Where is the literature of that time in which we could *expect* references to such records?" There is none ex-

¹ "Julicher remarks truly: 'The true merit of the Synoptists is that they, in spite of all their poetic touches, [*sic*] did not repaint but handed down the Christ of history.'" (The Biblical World, Nov., 1907, p. 348.)

cept the other New Testament books, and these all presuppose the great facts and teachings which we have in the Gospels.

We may well ask here, "Why is evidence demanded for the authorship and early origin of the New Testament which is never required in the case of the classics of Greece and Rome? Why, in the case of the New Testament books alone, is the date of writing determined by the date of the earliest quotations or references in other literature?" If the same rule were applied to the classics, we should have no works of Aristotle or Thucydides, or even of Virgil, Horace, or Tacitus. Look at the case of Roman authors contemporary with the writers of the New Testament. "Martial and Statius never mention one another; both might seem unknown to Tacitus. . . . Tacitus does not think it worth while to mention the *Histories* of the Emperor Claudius, the *Tragedies* of Seneca, or the *Punica* of Silius Italicus."

Then, as to the writings of Tacitus himself, this statement is made: "The case, then, of the writings of Tacitus stands thus: One passage of his *Histories* is cited within a hundred years of his death. Three centuries after his death there are in one author undoubted references to parts of the *Histories*, and one undoubted reference to a passage of the *Annals*, in another author a great many references to the *Histories*, in a third, a reference to one passage of the *Histories*." (R. E. C. Well-don, *Nineteenth Century and After*, October, 1907.)

Well may this writer say, "But, a theory which impugns the credit of all ancient literature disproves itself."

The first quotation we have of Tacitus, a contemporary of the Apostle John, is by Tertullian about 200 A.D. But Lardner estimates that in the writings of Tertullian alone there are more quotations from the New Testament, small book as it is, than there are "of all the works of Cicero, though of so un-

common excellence of thought and style, in the writings of all characters for several ages." (*Ibid.*) So there is no lack of quotation when there is literature in which it could be expected to appear.

In a case like this, as has been said, a conclusion can be reached only by a weighing of probabilities; and the conclusion can only be a probable one. Certainty cannot be reached without positive proof. But, considering the need of a whole generation of believers to have definite information constantly before them as the foundation of their belief; the common practice of making records in that day; the unexplained differences of phraseology in the different Gospels in describing the same events, which make the copying theory incredible; and the great contrast in the style, point of view, verbiage, and general atmosphere of the Gospels to that of the Epistles, it seems very probable that the Gospels contain evidence recorded very soon after the occurrence of the events of our Saviour's life. The identities in words and phrases in the Gospels are naturally explained by that "common substratum of apostolic teaching" which would naturally take form in the use of certain words and phrases during the time when the Apostles remained in Jerusalem, and the differences are absolutely inexplicable on the copying theory.

The very probable conclusion, then, would seem to be that the Gospels, whenever they may have been finally finished to suit them for use in all ages, contain written records made very soon after the events related. This conclusion must give to every one who confidently accepts it, a higher conception of the value of the Gospels. As Sir William Ramsay has well said: "A history which ultimately rests, partly on contemporary written evidence, partly on the evidence of eye-witnesses and actors in the events, stands on the highest plane of historic certainty."

Then, when we find rising to our view out of these records. above all heroes, all wise men, all philanthropists, the form of One like unto a Son of Man, a marvelous, unique Person, at once divine and human, who has directed, elevated and purified humanity as all other influences combined have failed to do, we have clear evidence that the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit was given these writers so that these things were written that we "may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God ; and that believing, we may have life in His name."

ARTICLE V.

A REMARKABLE CLAIM ON BEHALF OF THE
RADICAL CRITICISM.

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM MARCELLUS MCPHEETERS, D.D., LL. D.,
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

THE claim to which reference is here made is none the less remarkable for not being literally recent. As a matter of fact, it is so far from being literally recent that it is even a trifle stale from age. And yet the frequency and emphasis with which it has been reiterated during the past eighteen months or two years invest it with a sort of recency. I shall not pause to cite instances or even to give references. A single typical specimen will suffice to call up many others to the reader's mind. Just such a specimen is furnished to our hand in an editorial that appeared in the *Biblical World* for December, 1906. Under the caption "A Quarter Century of Old Testament Study," this editorial undertakes to set forth "the changes" which "within a generation" have taken place in what it calls "Christian thought" regarding the Old Testament, and indeed, I may say, regarding the Bible as a whole. It begins by recalling the general suspicion and aversion with which the Radical Criticism was viewed by the Christian public generally as recently as twenty-five years ago. It next points to the fact that the changed view of the Bible for which the Radical Criticism stands is being widely accepted to-day. Thereupon, it proceeds to ask,—

"Has this change of view been marked by that decline of religion and that loss of influence of the Bible which twenty-five years ago were honestly feared by many who to-day hold these views?"

and to answer its own question by saying,—

"On the contrary, the change has been in every way to the advantage of religion and the Bible."¹

As already intimated, the claim here set up is in no sense peculiar to the *Biblical World*. It may be found in the pages of such persuasive writers as Professor John Edgar McFadyen, Dr. Charles Foster Kent, and others, who during the past few years have been making earnest efforts to popularize and to commend to the confidence and acceptance of the Christian public the conclusions of what may without offense be called the Radical Criticism.² I cite the claim in the form in which it is put forward by the *Biblical World* simply because as there stated it presents us with a specially clear cut and tangible issue.

What, then, is the nature of this claim the validity of which

¹ *Biblical World*, December, 1906, p. 356.

² This term is used with deliberation, and the writer trusts with discrimination also. It is used in the hope that it may lead fair-minded persons to take account of a distinction that is too much lost sight of. I refer to the distinction between the findings of the Higher Criticism proper and the findings of the Radical School of the Higher Criticism. To make the Higher Criticism proper responsible for all the findings put forth in its name by those who—if we are going to use language with any discrimination—must be called the Radical School of higher critics, is a mistake that is none the less unfortunate and serious for being only too common. The unquestioned ability and distinction of the leaders of this school, together with their unfortunate habit of thinking and speaking of themselves in the "*L'état c'est moi*" style, has obscured in the public mind the fact that they are after all, in reality, but what may be called "the extreme left" in the parliament of Criticism. This ought not so to be. And without turning aside to discuss the difference between the different schools of higher critics, the writer feels entirely warranted in fixing attention upon the fact that there are different schools, and upon the further point that the character

we are to seek to test? In a general way it relates to the bearing upon the interests of religion and the Bible of what the writer has already more than once called the Radical Criticism.

But let us notice its precise form. The claim before us, then, is not that the conclusions of the Radical Criticism will not necessitate any substantive changes in our conceptions of the Bible. True, just that claim used to be made, and made with all the confidence and earnestness with which the claim now under consideration is being made. But such a claim need no longer concern us. It is safe to say that it has been hopelessly and finally discredited by advancing knowledge. At any rate those who make the claim now under examination tell us frankly that the conclusions of the Radical Criticism, if accepted, will necessitate a changed conception of the Bible.

Nor is the claim that we are to examine merely that the changed conceptions of the Bible necessitated by the conclusions of the Radical Criticism will not harmfully affect the influence of the Bible. It goes much beyond any such tame, negative assurances. The claim is that the changed conception of their respective conclusions is not determined by the fact that one school does, and another does not, use the methods of the Higher Criticism—for all alike use these methods—but by the manner in which they respectively employ these methods, and by the presuppositions that they respectively bring to their employment of them.

The writer wishes to say further, and to say distinctly, that in the use of the term Radical Criticism he is not insinuating opprobrium under the form of definition. That type of Criticism is properly called radical the conclusions of which are revolutionary, going to the very roots of current conceptions of the Bible and religion. Whether these conclusions are right as well as revolutionary is, of course, a separate question, and one to be decided strictly upon its own merits. But, in the meantime, those who regard the Higher Criticism as a legitimate discipline, and who themselves employ its methods, must in fairness be allowed some way of advertising the public that the revolutionary results put forth in the name of the Higher Criticism are not only not demanded, but, in their judgment, not even warranted by that discipline.

of the Bible necessitated by the Radical criticism "has been in every way to the advantage of religion and the Bible"—to the advantage not of religion only, but to that of the Bible also. The form of the verb used here shows clearly that the *Biblical World* does not regard itself as giving expression to what might be called merely an expert opinion, but as bearing testimony to a tested and verified matter of fact. "The change" of which it speaks is a change which it contemplates as having already been effected in the mind of the "Christian public," and one that has been effected for a sufficient length of time to reveal the kind of fruit that it may be expected to bear. Hence it does not say "the change will be found to be in every way to the advantage of religion and the Bible," but, quite specifically and distinctly, "the change has been in every way to the advantage of religion and the Bible." And thus it transfers the issue raised by the claim from the sphere of opinion to that of fact. It transfers the claim from a mere claim into a bit of testimony as to a matter of observed effects. In other words, the specific claim here set up by the *Biblical World* is, that the facts show that the changed conception of the Bible necessitated by the Radical Criticism, as tested in the sphere of experience and by its actually observed effects, "has been in every way to the advantage of religion and the Bible."

Several considerations invite to a careful examination of this claim:—

For one thing, those who make it are serious and honest men. When, therefore, they invite an investigation of their claim, we may be sure that they desire what they invite. They would not set up such a claim unless they themselves believed it well-grounded. And if in this belief they are laboring under a misconception, it is safe to presume that they will be pleased to be disabused of it.

If, on the other hand, their claim is well founded, then, the sooner all who love the Bible become apprised of the fact, the better will it be for the interest of religion and the Bible. And if additional justification of a somewhat detailed examination of this claim were needed, it would be furnished by the fact that, so far as the writer knows, in the sharply defined form in which it is here put forward, this claim has not up to this time received the careful testing to which its intrinsic importance and the high position of those who make the claim entitle it.

Finally the specific form in which the *Biblical World* has cast its not wholly unfamiliar claim will greatly facilitate our examination of it. As already indicated, it brings the matter to which the claim relates into the sphere of testimony. Our method of testing the validity of its claim is, therefore, decided for us. It will be simply to produce witnesses who shall be recognized as competent to testify as to the effects upon the influence of the Bible that up to the present time have been produced by the changed conception of the Bible necessitated by the findings of the Radical Criticism. Fortunately, such witnesses are not lacking. And the force of their testimony will be enhanced rather than otherwise because some of them very cordially believe that the changed conception of the Bible in question ought to, and in the end will, prove to be "to the advantage of religion and the Bible." One can only wish that he might rationally hope that they may be right. In the meantime, it will be observed that the writer cites them not as prophets but merely as witnesses.

The first witness whom I shall introduce is the late lamented Dr. William R. Harper, President of the University of Chicago, until his death the editor-in-chief of the *Biblical World* and a conspicuous and admirable figure in the ranks of the

radical critics of America. In the year 1904, Dr. Harper put out a little book entitled "Religion and the Higher Life." In this volume, as we are told in the preface, he gathered together the talks, more or less informal, which for several years previous he had been delivering before bodies of students. These addresses, as his preface also informs us, represent Dr. Harper's effort to discharge in a measure a responsibility which he declares weighed upon him more heavily than any other connected with the office which he had been called upon to administer. They all relate to what their author calls "the practical questions of a religious life." Here, then, we have one, himself a radical critic, possessed of a deep sense of his personal responsibility to promote the religious welfare of the students who passed under his hands, speaking to a body of students who lived in an atmosphere impregnated with the ideas of the Radical Criticism. It would look, therefore, as if in this connection, if anywhere, we should be entitled to expect to find conspicuously in evidence the advantages that have accrued to religion and the Bible from the Radical Criticism. But what does Dr. Harper himself say? These are his words:—

"And yet, I have noticed that with each recurring year it has required a greater effort on my part to undertake this kind of service. I have asked myself whether, as a matter of fact, it was growing more difficult to deal with subjects of this kind in a university atmosphere."¹

The tone of sadness and the consciousness of failure that is in these words is unmistakable. There is no suggestion that Dr. Harper found the task to which he had set himself lightened by the advantages accruing to religion and the Bible from the type of criticism of which he himself was a conspicuous advocate.

My second witness shall be Mrs. Louise Seymour Hough-

¹ Preface, p. viii.

ton. Mrs. Houghton was formerly editor of the *New York Evangelist*. Last year, she published a very readable and instructive book entitled "Hebrew Life and Thought." This book issued from the press of the University of Chicago. In its preface Mrs. Houghton says:—

"The purpose of these papers was not, and is not, to give forth original ideas, but to bring the more or less cultured but unscientific Bible student into a hospitable attitude toward the new light that scholarship has shed upon the sacred page. It has long been my conviction that if scientific scholarship had more generously availed itself of this method of culture, it would not have aroused that alarm and antagonism with which it even yet has to reckon."¹

I presume that the great body of Bible students would be included among those whom Mrs. Houghton here speaks of as "unscientific." It is clear, however, that in calling them "unscientific" she does not mean to describe them as unintelligent. On the contrary, she speaks of them as persons of more or less culture. Here, then, is a large body of Bible students who, according to the testimony of Mrs. Houghton, have failed to perceive the advantages to religion and the Bible accruing from the Radical Criticism, and that notwithstanding the fact that they are confessedly persons of more or less culture.

But Mrs. Houghton gives even more directly significant testimony than this. After having called attention to the conspicuous, one might even say the dominating, influence exercised by the Bible upon English literature in the past, she adds:—

"Few young people of to-day have a verbal acquaintance with the Old Testament, and it will soon become necessary to edit all our greatest writers, even such novelists as Hardy and Stevenson, with explanations of the Biblical allusions."²

And here I must beg attention to the fact that Mrs. Houghton speaks more particularly, doubtless, for the young people

¹ Preface, p. viii.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 24.

of her own circle—that is to say, please observe, for those who have grown up in the atmosphere of the Radical Criticism. Certainly if she can be relied upon as a well-informed witness. the advantages to religion and the Bible that have accrued from the Radical Criticism are of a most extraordinary and doubtful kind.

Let us hear another witness. This time it is a correspondent of the *Interior*, a Presbyterian paper published in Chicago and known to many. His statement will be found in the issue of September 5, 1904, under the caption "Folks, Places, and Things." He is giving what purports to be the actual experience of a Presbyterian minister. This minister says:—

"One fall there came to us a splendid young fellow from Chicago University to train the boys in football. I liked him and got to know him very confidentially. One day to my surprise he told me that a year before he had intended to enter the ministry, but after taking a year in the divinity school of the University of Chicago he had thrown up the whole idea."

The minister goes on to say:—

"I asked him what had changed his plans.

"'I'll have to be candid with you,' he answered; 'I suppose I was already getting a good deal mixed about some things just in my own private thinking, but it was the lectures of Professor Foster that convinced me that I had no business trying to be a preacher.'

"'What did Dr. Foster teach you?'"

"'Well, he showed that there was nothing miraculous about the Bible; that the religion of the Jews just grew up naturally like other religions; and that Jesus Christ was the Son of God only in the same sense that all of us are; that the miracle stories can't any of them be true; that the death of Jesus didn't do anything for us; that it's our own character that saves us and we don't need the benefit of anybody else's character, and so on—all that goes with that. When I found I believed all this, I didn't seem to have anything to preach, and so I gave it up.'"

I might cite further from the statements of the same witness, but surely it is not necessary. Here, then, we have the claim set up by the *Biblical World* put to a crucial test under the

most favorable conditions, and the reader sees what is the outcome. Please observe I do not now introduce the question "Was the young man right in the conclusion that he reached?" I simply call attention to the plain matter of fact that the outcome of the acceptance of the results of the Radical Criticism in this case was that the Bible and the religion of the Bible were thoroughly discredited in the mind of this young man.

The next witness who shall be permitted to speak as to the claim set up by the *Biblical World* is Dr. Charles Foster Kent, formerly of the University of Chicago and now of Yale. No one can charge Dr. Kent with any disposition to be a swift witness against the Radical Criticism. Last year he put forth a volume entitled "The Origin and Permanent Value of the Old Testament." The opening sentence of the preface of this volume reads as follows:—

"During the past generation the Old Testament has commanded equally with the New the enthusiastic and devoted study of the great body of biblical scholars throughout the world."

The next sentence but one, however, reads as follows:—

"At the same time the tendency of the rank and file of the Christian church within the past decade has undoubtedly been to neglect the older Testament."

A little further along in his preface I find him saying:—

"If, on the other hand, the prevailing apathy and neglect are due to ignorance of the real character and value of the Old Testament, let us lose no time in setting ourselves right."¹

And on the tenth page of his book, after having criticised the methods of certain scholars of his school in bringing the results of their work to the attention of the public, he suggests that had they shown more wisdom

"many open-minded people might have been saved from the supreme error of writing, consciously or unconsciously, '*Ichabod*' across the pages of their Old Testament."

¹ *Op. cit.*, Preface, p. vi.

Far be it from me to intimate that Dr. Kent means to say that the effects indicated ought to have followed as the natural result of the Radical Criticism. On the contrary, one object of his book is to show that the Radical Criticism, properly understood, is wholly "to the advantage of religion and the Bible." I have cited him not for his expert opinion as to what the result of the Radical Criticism ought to be, but as a witness to what, as a matter of fact, those results, up to this time, have actually been. And you will observe that, while he holds to the theory that the results ought to have been very different, he confesses that, as a matter of fact, the actual outcome of this kind of criticism has been that many open-minded people, either consciously or unconsciously, have been led to write "Ichabod" across the pages of their Old Testament.

The next witness whom I shall cite is Dr. Andrew C. Zenos, of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago. In January of the year 1907, Dr. Zenos wrote for the *Homiletic Review* an article entitled "The Established Results of Old Testament Study." In this article he shows himself to be, I will not say partial to what I have called the Radical Criticism, but certainly not hostile to it. Later in the discussion he says:—

"But from another point of view we may ask the matter of fact question: What effect has the use of the critical method had on men's judgment of the Old Testament as a book of religious inspiration and instruction? It is not to be denied that the well-meant but ill-advised warnings of some on one side, and the rash claims of some unbelievers on the other have persuaded many to look on this sort of study as dangerous to the Christian faith, and the Old Testament has suffered a partial eclipse."

Let the reader note Dr. Zenos's words. He says distinctly, "The Old Testament has suffered a partial eclipse." It is true that Dr. Zenos does not regard this as the direct or legitimate result of the prevalence of the Radical Criticism. On the contrary, he ascribes this result in part to the ill-advised warnings

of some on one side, and in part to the rash claims of some unbelievers on the other side, in the controversy called forth by the Radical Criticism. Further, it is fair to direct attention to the fact that immediately after the statement that "the Old Testament has suffered partial eclipse," Dr. Zenos adds, "But it is emerging from this temporary obscurity fuller than it was ever known to be of spiritual illumination." The reader, however, will easily discriminate between Dr. Zenos's personal opinions and cheerful prognostications on the one hand, and his statements as to the actual outcome of the Radical Criticism up to this time. He says explicitly that "the Old Testament has suffered a partial eclipse." And now I ask, With whom has it "suffered a partial eclipse"? It has certainly suffered no such eclipse in the case of the present writer. The Old Testament never appeared to him more certainly and luminously divine in its origin and teachings. Nor has it suffered eclipse with those who hold to the present writer's conception of the Bible. For them, the Old Testament is to-day what it has always been for them, namely, "the oracles of God," "the scriptures of truth." With whom, then, has the Old Testament suffered the partial eclipse of which Dr. Zenos speaks? I answer, It is with those, and only with those, who have given a too-easy credence to the claims of the Radical Criticism. I do not say, and the reader will please observe that I do not now say, that the Old Testament ought to have suffered even a partial eclipse with those just referred to. It may be that in permitting it to suffer such an eclipse they were doing an injustice alike to the Bible, to the Radical Criticism, and to themselves. But the fact remains, that, Dr. Zenos himself being witness, the Old Testament *has suffered* such an eclipse in the case of those who have lent a too-credulous ear to the teachings of the Radical Criticism.

The next witness who shall testify upon the issue raised by the *Biblical World* is no less a person than Professor Goldwin Smith, and one whose well-earned distinction in the realm of letters, and in other departments of learning, is, I take it, familiar to the readers of this journal. In 1906 Professor Smith put forth a little volume entitled "In Quest of Light." In it he gathers up and puts in permanent form a series of letters from his pen which had appeared from time to time in the *New York Sun*. The first essay in the book opens with the following sentences:—

"One clergyman, it seems, denies the infallibility of the Bible and treats the Church as an association for general improvement. A second finds in the Bible inaccuracy and worse. A third professes to believe only so much of the Bible as commends itself to his judgment."

It closes with the following sentence:—

"The three eminent clergymen, it is to be feared, are sliding down a slippery incline, on which no permanent foothold is to be found."

The essay as a whole really amounts to a well-meant bit of courteously given advice to clergymen, of the stamp indicated in the opening sentence, not to overpress the policy of silence or dissimulation in dealing with the general public. Professor Smith thinks that it would be an unfortunate impression to go abroad, that the clergy are, so to speak, dedicated to falsehood. He reminds them that, while caution and tenderness will always be in order, these are not incompatible with sincerity and frankness. And here the writer pauses to ask: Who are the clergy that have laid themselves open to this kind of counsel from this source? Are they those who hold with Christ and the apostles that Moses gave the law. Are they those who hold with the Apostle Paul that the Old Testament is "the oracles of God"? Hardly, I think. They are rather those who have taken up a hospitable attitude toward what is called "the new

light " that the Radical Criticism is supposed to have shed upon the sacred page. They furnish us a concrete illustration of the new ethics to which the Radical Criticism leads.

But I return to Professor Smith. Here is what he has to say as to the effect of what he inaccurately calls the "higher criticism":—

"It can hardly be denied that between the higher criticism on one side and Darwin's momentous discovery on the other, materialism, in the scientific and philosophic sense, positive or negative, is gaining ground. We are called upon at all events to find a new warrant for spiritual life, for reliance on the dictates of conscience, for any hopes that we may have cherished of existence beyond the grave, for confidence in a divine order of the universe. We can no longer believe that the miscellany of Hebrew writings, many of them of doubtful authorship and date, some of them plainly mythical, are a divine revelation. Nor is anything to be hoped from an attempt to evade the difficulty by suggesting that Deity, in its dealings with man, had to accommodate itself to the Darwinian law of evolution. Of the Gospels, criticism has spared only the character and teachings of Jesus, which, on any hypothesis, have given birth to Christendom. In the authenticity, contemporaneity and harmony of the documents we can confide no more. We can no longer sincerely accept the evidence for the Incarnation, the Immaculate Conception, the miracles, the Resurrection; or deem it such as would certainly have been given in proof of a revelation, which was to be the light of the world. Moreover, the Fall being a myth, as it is now allowed on almost all hands to be, there is no ground for the Incarnation and the Atonement, a disclosure which in itself is fatal to the dogmatic and traditional creed of Christendom. Nor, we must sorrowfully confess, is the collapse of our evidence limited to the case of revelation."¹

And still, in the light of such testimony as this, the *Biblical World* has the hardihood to declare that the change wrought by the Radical Criticism has been wholly to the advantage of the Bible and religion!

I might introduce a score of other equally competent and unbiased witnesses as to the effect of the Radical Criticism upon religion and the Bible in the case of those who lend a

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 126.

too-credulous ear to its claim; but I must forbear, and content myself with citing just one other witness on this point. I refer to Dr. Frederick Delitzsch. Many of my readers will recall the sensation that was created by two lectures that he delivered before the Emperor of Germany, and that he subsequently published under the title of "Babel and Bible." Let us hear what are the conclusions in regard to the Bible to which Dr. Delitzsch himself has been led by the Radical Criticism. I quote:—

"And this inconsistency produces an increasingly widening gulf. When, e.g., a theologian of no less authority writes (26th January, 1903), 'You criticise a conception of Revelation that sensible Protestants no longer share; it is that of the antiquated Lutheran Dogmatists. . . . All divine revelation is, of course, affected by the human medium, and must therefore have historically developed'; he describes exactly the standpoint that I myself advocate, only I regard the conception of 'divine revelation' as held by the Church and that of a historical, i.e. human, development, to be irreconcilable contradictions. Either we take one or the other. *Tertium non datur*.

"I hold the view that in the Old Testament we have to deal with a development effected or permitted by God like any other product of this world, but, for the rest, of a purely human and historical character, in which God has not intervened through a 'special, supernatural revelation.'"¹

And what is the gist of this statement? It is this, Dr. Delitzsch has been forced to the conclusion that for those who, with himself, hold to the results of the Radical Criticism, to apply the term "divine revelation" to the Bible is a gross solecism, or an offensive dishonesty. How any thoughtful man can dispute the correctness of Dr. Delitzsch's contention is beyond the comprehension of the writer. If, then, it be in every way to the advantage of religion and the Bible that the Old Testament should be irretrievably divested of its character as the Word of God, of course the claim of the *Biblical World*

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 166. The edition referred to is that issued by the Open Court Press, Chicago, 1903.

stands vindicated. But to me this seems a contradiction in terms.

In conclusion the writer has only two remarks to make. One is that he has of set purpose avoided dragging into his discussion the question of the correctness or the incorrectness of the findings of the Radical Criticism. This he recognizes as the ultimate question; and one to be settled upon its own proper evidence. The *Biblical World* and those whom it represents believe, of course, that those findings are correct. On the other hand, the writer and those whom he represents regard them as incorrect and unwarranted. And sooner or later the reader will have to line himself up with the one view or the other. But even though he should come to the conclusion that the findings of the Radical Criticism are correct, and therefore entitled to his acceptance, it need not follow that he will hug to his soul the fond delusion that these findings are "in every way to the advantage of religion and the Bible." If they are correct, then no doubt sooner or later we shall all have to accept them, and that even though they should be to the advantage neither of the Bible nor of religion. In the meantime, in the light of the evidence submitted, it is evident that one will not be wiser if he permits the assurance that the changed view of the Bible necessitated by the findings of the Radical Criticism has been "in every way to the advantage of religion and the Bible" to cause him too lightly to accept those findings.

The other remark that seems to be justified by the evidence is, that the claim that we have been considering, proceeding from the source from which it does, represents either a singularly infelicitous use of the familiar terms, or an ignorance of the facts testified to by the unimpeachable witnesses cited above that is as deplorable as it is surprising.

ARTICLE VI.

CIRCUMCISION AMONG THE SAMARITANS.

BY JACOB, SON OF AARON, HIGH PRIEST OF THE SAMARITANS AT
SHECHEM.¹

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

THE treatise which follows is the fourth chapter in a work on the Samaritan religion by Jacob, the present high priest. According to his account, it was written several years ago for an English scholar, who died before the book was completed.

The three previous chapters have been published, from time to time, in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA*, and the remainder of the work is undergoing translation at the hands of Professor Ben Kori.

The present chapter treats of the interesting and delicate subject of "Circumcision," and is in the nature, first, of an exposition of the Samaritan practice, and, secondly, of a polemic against the Jew. In this chapter, more than in either of those previously presented, the Samaritans appear as sticklers for the very letter of the Law. No Pharisee could possibly contend more earnestly for every jot and tittle than do these Samaritan priests. When the priest assures us that a child not circumcised the eighth day ought to be killed, we are hardly to assume that this theory is carried into actual practice; yet such a statement carries with it his profound conviction that it were far better that such a man should never have been born. No exigency, whatever, justifies the neglect of this rite, or its postponement by even a day.

The origin of circumcision is a matter of dispute. Several ancient nations are known to have practised it. The conjecture that it was once a mark of servitude finds some support in the High Priest's treatise, where he says, "He becomes a slave to this high God (may he be praised), owned by him whose mark is that of the master's slave, forever indelible."

The proof of the slaughter of an enemy described in 1 Samuel xviii. 25-27, and 2 Samuel iii. 14, appears not to have been uncommon in

¹ Translated from the Arabic by Professor Abdullah Ben Kori, Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oregon; Edited by William E. Barton, D.D., Oak Park, Illinois.

old-time warfare; and it is conjectured that mutilation was not always confined to the dead, and that the excision which at the outset insured complete eunuchry was modified in the case of slaves as time went on.

In Egypt, and other countries of the Old World, rites similar to those of the Jews were practised by way of initiation into the congregation. It is well known that the practice finds increasing favor among medical men of the present day.

The High Priest's curious little polemic has, therefore, a certain interest and value.

The High Priest has his own answer to the suggestion that Moses himself was negligent concerning the practice of this ordinance in his own household. He contends that here, as in other places, the Jewish scriptures have been falsified. His curious argument speaks for itself, and is given here for whatever it may be judged to be worth. It is safe to affirm that these chapters give a more intimate view of the Samaritan religion than anything hitherto published in the English language, and they have their value, at least as studies in ethnology and comparative religion.

The translator and the editor join in the hope that the publication of these first-hand studies may contribute to a better understanding of this small and fast disappearing sect.—WILLIAM E. BARTON.

A TREATISE ON CIRCUMCISION.

THIS treatise is concerning circumcision, its conditions and the regulations among the Samaritan people, with a mention of the difference existing between them and the Jewish people in regard to this ordinance, according as it is current among them in these days and as handed down from ancient times.

CIRCUMCISION ON THE EIGHTH DAY.

If the boy is born after the total submersion of the disk of the sun, seven days must pass; and on the eighth he is circumcised. It is likewise done if he is born at night or on the following day. Should he be born before the submersion of the disk of the sun, even half an hour earlier, that day must be counted as one, and the boy is circumcised on the eighth. The Samaritans believe that on the eighth day the babe must be circumcised under all circumstances, and the rite may be

performed during any of its hours. It is better, however, that the same should take place just at sunrise, or shortly thereafter, that honor may be rendered to the ordinance.

AN UNCIRCUMCISED CHILD TO BE SLAIN.

The Samaritans believe that if the entire eighth day should pass without circumcision, the killing of the babe would become obligatory. The uncircumcised child shall not be called a Hebrew; and purification shall never be lawful unto him. Therefore nothing hinders the Samaritans from circumcising the male child; no excuse is valid on that day, whether it be sickness or accident, or the absence of his father; nor must the rite be postponed even should the day fall on the Sabbath or a festival day. None of these is to be taken into account.

DIFFERENCES IN THE HABITS OF THE JEWS.

In this matter there is a wide difference between the Samaritans and the Jews. The latter make it lawful unto them, because of well-known reasons, to postpone circumcision for a period of thirty days. Our Torah, however, in regard to the command of this ordinance, given to our lord Abraham (upon whom be peace), reads as follows: "And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin on the eighth day, that soul shall be cut off from his people." Thus it is believed by the Samaritans that if circumcision is postponed later than the eighth day, the boy is not to be looked upon as an Israelite in this world, nor shall he be gathered with the people of God in the day of judgment. He is neither pure nor can he ever be subject to purity. The command which is found in the Jewish Torah differs from that in ours; it reads as follows: "But the male who is uncircumcised in the foreskin of his flesh, that soul shall be cut off from his people" (Gen. xvii. 14). They have omitted from this verse

biom hasheminy, that is "on the eighth day"; and this accounts for the license they have taken for postponing circumcision. They, however, are at variance with the command of God (may he be exalted) in several respects, which will be shown later in this chapter.

HOW THE ACT IS PERFORMED.

On the seventh day of the birth of the babe, he is washed and cleansed, and on the eighth day his father or guardian invites the priest and his family, his friends and the tribe living in his town, and also some man who is expert in the art of circumcision. It is preferable that the latter be one of his own people, if there is such a one. He may be chosen from another people in case no Samaritan is expert in the performance of the rite, so that less injury may be done to the babe and serious harm may be avoided. This function must be taught to a Samaritan by the learned men of the people. But circumcision with us means only the cutting off of the foreskin. The Jews make an addition to what God has commanded; for their *hac-ham*, "doctors," make necessary the removal of a larger portion of the skin than the prepuce, sometimes denuding the phallus, which they call *perih*, which does not correspond with the circumcision known in the Hebrew language as *nemileh*. We do not practise this as the Jews do, for we think theirs is an addition to the divine command, and has not been revealed as such.

The high priest and the circumciser, and all those who have been invited to be present, after they have been gathered together, stand up; and the priest begins the prayer designed for such a ceremony and known as "the prayer of circumcision." It is opened in the name of the high God (may he be exalted) and with the mention of his oneness and the confession of his

Godship. Then the Surahs of Creation are read, in which is mentioned the creation of the world from the beginning until the creation of our father Adam (upon whom be peace). The reading is done in Hebrew, the ancient language which the Samaritans still preserve. The guests also read some verses of the histories of our holy forefathers, also the command that was delivered to our forefather Abraham, the friend of God (may he be exalted), in regard to the ordinance of circumcision, and his fulfilment of this ordinance and his obedience to its directions.

They read also the command as given for the second time to our lord Moses (upon whom be peace) in regard to this ceremony, together with verses containing a mention of the covenants and blessings of God (may he be exalted), as revealed in the Torah. Then the cutting off of the foreskin takes place while a hymn is read, containing useful ideas and written in the best Hebrew style. It is of ancient date, being the composition of the High Priest Merkah. This high priest and most learned writer lived fully two hundred years before Christ.

THE HYMN OF CIRCUMCISION.

The hymn opens with the glorification of the great Creator (may he be exalted), who made the image of man perfect and gave him directions for his life. It contains thanksgiving to God (may he be exalted), who has helped his people to keep this ordinance until the present age and throughout the generations of Israel. It contains also congratulations to the father upon the circumcision of his son, and the assurance of obtaining reward for the fulfilment of this ordinance; also a prayer to God (may he be praised) for the safe keeping and blessing of the boy. A mention is also made of our lord Abraham (upon whom be peace) in whose days this permanent statute was established.

It explains the fact that he who is circumcised on the eighth day is marked with the covenant of his Master; he becomes a slave to this high God (may he be praised), owned by him whose mark is, like that of the master's slave, forever indelible.

THE MENTION OF GERMON.

At the end of this hymn, a mention is made of a Roman chief by the name Germon. The mention of this man reads as follows: "Let Germon the Roman chief be mentioned for good." The reason is that in those days when the Romans were conquerors, there was a king by the name Tehos. He oppressed the Samaritans and set over them prefects who would forbid them to pray and read the Torah and to perform their ordinances such as circumcision, and the other acts of their faith. In those days there lived a high priest by the name Akbon. And the prefect that the Roman king had set over him was the aforesaid Germon. The latter watched closely, day and night, the door of the house of the High Priest, never departing from his place and possessing much prudence and courage, so that the High Priest Akbon and his family were exceedingly afraid of him. It happened that in those days, God (may he be praised) blessed the High Priest Akbon with a son, and the parent had much anxiety and concern wondering how and what he should do in order to circumcise the boy according to the requirements of the ordinance in all its regulations and directions. He gathered his family and the chiefs of his people, and took the advice as to the best way and means whereby the circumcision of the babe and the fulfilments of the ordinance might take place, and it was agreed that the High Priest should take the boy to the wilderness, on the eighth day, and there secretly circumcise him. On the eighth day the High Priest took a large straw-

basket, wrapped the babe with wool, and put him within the basket and covered him also with some wool, and said to one of the women of the house, a maid servant: "Take this basket and go out with it to a place near by the town called Ras Alain [a place called by the same name unto this day], and I will meet you there." As she was going out with the basket Germon saw her, but did not speak ill to her, although he knew well that the boy was within the basket, but said to her: "Go thy way and do thy work in joy." Not meeting with resistance, she proceeded to the High Priest and informed him of what the guard had told her. The High Priest was therefore terrified and said unto the woman: "Let him do what it pleases him, but my trust is in God alone; may his will be done." Then he went into a cave that was thereabouts and circumcised the boy himself and put him again into the same basket, covering him with wool, and handed him to the woman, after having pacified him of the pain of circumcision.

She returned with him home, and after a while the High Priest Akbon went his way home, but the guard stood up and met him and kissed his hand and said in the Hebrew language, "Rabbi, Rabbi, Allyz!" which means: "My lord, My lord, with joy." For Germon was an intelligent man and knew the Hebrew language because of his familiarity with this people of Israel, who spoke only Hebrew in those days.

When the High Priest heard these words from the guard. with much fear he went into his place, filled his hand with gold coins, and returned to Germon, saying, "Accept this little from me, for the much I would like, if I were able, to offer to you." Germon answered and said, "God forbid that I should sell my good deeds for worldly gain!" The fear of the High Priest increased greatly, because Germon refused to accept the gold. The latter, however, told him, "Quiet yourself

and fear not, for what I have done is for God (may he be exalted); but to please you I will take only three coins, as if I had taken them all. Rejoice, therefore, in your son, and may the Lord preserve him for you. I only wish that you institute a memorial among your people for reminding them of what I have done, that it may be kept among them to the end of time; therefore promise me that it shall be done."

The High Priest replied to him in accordance with his demands, and made a covenant with him. That very hour the fear of the Lord (who is exalted) became great in the heart of the High Priest, and he praised and glorified God (may he be praised) with exceeding gratitude for his abounding favors. He rejoiced immensely in his son, and in company with the Samaritans of that place, he uttered praises and thanks and said to those present: "Let us institute a perpetual memorial of what has taken place; and let us mention fitly this good man whenever there is a circumcision of a boy."

The words of the prayer are as follows: "How but with praise should be remembered Germon, the Roman chief?"

This is how we remember with thanks this Roman guard, a memorial which is kept unto our own day.

NAMING THE BOY.

By the time this hymn has ended, the circumcision is at an end also. Then the High Priest goes to the father of the boy and inquires, *Mah Shmoh?* meaning, "What is his name?" and the name which the father gives and has been decided upon, shall be the name of the boy and can never be changed. The answer of the High Priest is, "Blessed be the name"; he blesses also those present and delivers an address to that end, and all is done in the ancient Hebrew Samaritan language. AND TO GOD BELONGS THE BEST KNOWLEDGE.

THE ARGUMENT AGAINST THE JEWS.

It is proper to add some remarks concerning the differences between us and the Jews. This ordinance is one of the greatest ordinances among this people. It must be fulfilled and the presence of those invited is necessary, wherever the place may be. Gladness and festivals are the order of the day. Fidelity to this covenant is of the most supreme importance, for should the Samaritans neglect, in the least, the fulfilment of this ordinance, the covenant of God (who is to be praised) would be broken with them. They believe that this ordinance is most exacting. No delay should be made beyond the eighth day, even if it should fall on the Sabbath or on a feast day. On such days the fulfilment of this ordinance and the circumcision of the boy are compulsory, although they themselves are of an exacting nature with definite regulations which, they believe, are transcended by those of circumcision. If a man be on a journey and his wife be with child, he must be ready in case of emergency to fulfil this ordinance. The Samaritans do not follow the practice of the Jews to postpone circumcision, and cite the command prepared by their priests who have garbled the word of God (may he be exalted) in regard to this matter, namely, "But the uncircumcised male whose foreskin is not cut on that day, that soul shall be cut off from his people." But of this command the Jews have omitted the words "on the eighth day." Therefore they take a great liberty in the fulfilment of circumcision, delaying its appointed time in most cases, in spite of the fact that the day has been often set definitely by the apostle of God, Moses (upon whom be peace). Leviticus xii., which begins with *Wayedabber IHWH*, etc., says in its third verse, "And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised." Again in Genesis xvii. 12, "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every male

throughout your generations." This command was given to our lord Abraham (upon whom be peace). Plain as this command may be, the Jewish people practise much license in its fulfilment. If on the eighth day the child may be sick, his circumcision is postponed to the following day; to the tenth and eleventh day. It is likewise done, if the father of the child happens to be absent; the circumcision is postponed until the return of the father, though it may extend for months.

Verily this is the worst apostasy!

THE CIRCUMCISION OF THE SON OF MOSES.

The Jews interpret falsely the words of God (may he be exalted), and they place Moses (upon whom be peace) on the wrong side in reference to circumcision, claiming that he himself postponed the circumcision of his son¹ Eliezer (upon whom be peace), and that it was the mother of the boy that performed it. This they make up out of what is said about our lady Zipporah, the wife of our lord Moses (upon whom be peace), namely, *Watikroth eth garlat benmah*, which means, according to us, "To cut off the uncleanness of her upbuilding," or rather to cut her off from having children. But the Jews read it as "She cut the foreskin of her son." Now all the difference proceeds from the reading of the Hebrew word, which is composed of the three letters b-n-h. We read it by doubling the letter "n," while the Jews do not. And as this question is of great interest, being as it is the source of difference between us and the Jews, in matter of interpretation and pronunciation, it is fit that its discussion be appended to this chapter.

We believe that the interpretation adopted by the Jews and which is strictly believed by them of Exodus iv. 24, discredits the mission of the apostle Moses (upon whom be peace).

¹ Gershom. See Ex. ii. 22.

HOW THE JEWS DISHONOR MOSES.

They say that while Moses was on the way by the stopping-place, God sent his angel to slay him, because the circumcision of his newly born son Eliezer was not performed in time, but delayed, and therefore God (may he be exalted) was angry and intended to destroy him. When the angel found him and was about to slay him, Zipporah, his wife, knowing the reason, which was the postponement of the circumcision of his son, immediately took a sharp flint and cut off the foreskin of her son, and as the apostle was about to approach her, she took hold of his legs and said to him interrogatively, "Wilt thou be my bridegroom while I am in the birthblood?" The angel seeing what she had done was pleased with her, and refrained from slaying the apostle, when she said, "A bridegroom of blood art thou," and because she performed the ordinance of circumcision. Behold how daring are the Jews in their insults and in their interpretations, which bring dishonor on the apostle! Verily, they are beside themselves!

ANOTHER JEWISH INSULT TO MOSES.

Some of them have a different interpretation. They say that the words "So he let him alone" refer to the boy Eliezer. The angel was swallowing him up because his circumcision was delayed. The process of swallowing began with the head, and when it reached the secrets of the boy, his mother took hold of him by the legs and the angel let him alone.

THE SAMARITAN INTERPRETATION.

The Samaritan people, on the other hand, interpret the passage in this manner: It happened that while on the way by the stopping-place, the angel of the Lord met him and sought

to incite him,¹ and Zipporah took distress and cut off the uncleanness of her being built up by him;² and she approached his feet and said, "Thou art a bridegroom of blood to me," and he let her alone.³ Then she said, "Thou art a spouse of blood to me" until he ceased off. They comment on this passage as follows: When the apostle Moses sought to retire in that stopping-place, God sent his angel to incite and encourage him. Zipporah, seeing the light of the angel and that of her husband, was much terrified and afflicted, both on account of the majestic presence of the angel and the conviction that her husband had been raised to a high sphere of spirituality. She was struck with a great fear, and for the reasons mentioned before she lost all hope in being "upbuilt" any longer by him, as if she swore off and cut away the uncleanness of cohabitation with him, for the word *garlah*, "foreskin," means, also, "uncleanliness" or "unholiness," as an example can be produced in the Torah bearing us in this interpretation. Therefore she begged her leave of him and approached his feet and kissed them and said to him, "Thou art a blood spouse unto me"; and thereupon the apostle Moses (upon him be peace) let her alone, and granted her what she desired, and dismissed her to her father, together with her children, at that very time. What proves our contention, namely, that Moses did really dismiss her here and give her a divorce, is Exodus xviii. 2, where we find the words *ahar shellooheyhab*, that is, "after he

¹ Apparently this reading is due to the fact that the Samaritans derive the form *hemito*, "his slaying," from the root *hamah*, which means "to incite, excite, and make a turmoil," and not from *moot*.—Tr.

² The Samaritans derive the word *bnh* from *banah*, which means "to build up, to have children."—Tr.

³ The Samaritan reading differs in this instance and in the others from the Hebrew reading. The third pers. pron. suffix is *ah*, "her," and not *o*, "him," as the Hebrew reads. —Tr.

had dismissed her." We need not assert again that we have proofs of a large number consisting of similar passages in the Torah in favor of this interpretation. Behold, therefore, intelligent readers! how degrading is the interpretation the Jews adopted to the noble station of our lord Moses ben 'Amran (upon whom be peace)! To plan death and deal destruction are the greatest punishment which could be devised. They indicate the horrible crime of the doer, which is impossible in the dignity of the apostle. Such an attempt on the part of God (may he be praised) reflects with fallacy and vain purposes to his divine omniscience. Did He not speak to him face to face? Did He not make him acquainted with all the miracles and perform them through him? Did He not thereby teach mankind obedience to Him and watchfulness in their duties towards Him and the purpose which they neglected and for which they were created, to do righteousness and acts of piety, to worship Him and know Him, who is highly exalted? He made it well known to us from his predilection to Moses, that he (Moses) was the first and best fitted for obeying him, the man of the most steadfast will and resolution to stand to and abide by all his laws, thereby attaining a degree of perfection which no other creature had ever reached. The informing answers and questions the apostle asked from God (may he be exalted) did in no wise add knowledge to God's: otherwise, how could God (who is to be praised) trust him with his mission, knowing him to be faithless? Would not this supposition reflect upon God?

THE JEWS LIBEL ZIPPORAH.

The Jews claim that Zipporah was in childbirth, or about to deliver a child at that time. But to approach or touch a woman in such a state was polluting and prohibited among the people of Jacob. Compare Genesis xxxi. 35, "*Ky lo ookal lakoom*

meppaneyka ky derek nashm ly," which means that she could not approach him to do her duty towards him as she had her flux. If the Jews declare that *circumcision* in time is more binding, and obliges one to suffer the company of his wife in such a state, we answer, Herewith you contradict yourselves, as you occasionally believe that Moses (upon whom be peace) thought of the necessity of circumcising his son, and therefore suffered to accompany his wife, who was about to give birth to a child, and at other times you declare that he decided to postpone the circumcision of his son, in order that he might not be delayed in his journey or his mission, and that therefore it became the duty of his wife to perform it. You also say that he did not rely on his wife in performing the same: therefore it became his duty to do it himself which, according to you, he did not: and thus you contradict yourselves in two ways. You attribute to the apostle fallacy in belief, in decision and in deed, but he (may the peace of God be on him!) is far too noble to be touched by what you say and attribute of neglect and transgression, thereby deserving such a punishment for such a great crime.

A SUMMARY OF THE ERRORS OF THE JEWS.

The Jews are mistaken in assigning to Moses (upon whom be peace) the predilection of fulfilling one ordinance to the detriment of another, and asserting that the wife of Moses (upon whom be peace) was wiser than he, and more resolute than he was, and that she performed the circumcision herself. With such a belief it results that Moses (upon whom be peace) committed several errors. Among these was that of having accompanied his wife while she was in the blood of childbirth, which is the first error. The second is that of having purposely postponed the circumcision of his son, for, as they pretend, he was departing with that intention. The third is that

of allowing the date of circumcision to pass by and his wife to perform the ordinance while he decided to neglect. They say also that the apostle feared lest in circumcising his son, there might result a delay to his mission, and therefore he did not do it. Truly they err, and charge the apostle with ignorance for having a predilection in fulfilling one command while neglecting another. They attribute to him the sin of not having remedied his wrong, but allege that it was his wife who became aware of the duty, and performed the deed of which he was worthier and to which he had a greater right.

Their statements contradict the passage they have in their book of Joshua, that the people of Israel, in spite of the presence of Moses (upon whom be peace), had not been circumcised during the forty years they spent in the wilderness, as is declared in Deuteronomy: "These forty years the Lord has been with thee, and thou hast missed nothing," but as to the apostle, God (may he be exalted) would slay him because he postponed the circumcision of his son! It is evident that their scriptures and belief are false and contradictory, to which no sane-minded person can give long assent. To claim, as they do, that the children of Israel neglected the ordinance of circumcision for a period of forty years, during which all their sons were left uncircumcised, is a bold error. It is self-contradictory, and can easily be made void from many points of view, and through many testimonies and passages from the Law, the simple mentioning of which would be too lengthy for this abridged book. It is enough to have proved that their interpretation of Exodus iv. 24-26 is false, and that the lawlessness with which they charge the apostle is untrue, for the reading of the passage is liable to different pronunciations, and its meaning is thereby wholly changed. Thus different interpretations may be attached to it, and the best and nearest to rea-

son is the one adopted by the Samaritan people, according as they have received their traditions, both in point of correct reading and interpreting the same. For one can easily see that such are nobler and not liable to those charges to which we have already called the attention of the reader. The Samaritans have in the books of their learned teachers a strong commentary and clear explanation which favor their claim, but which are of a linguistic nature, and we have refrained from recording them down, as this is not the purpose of this book.

THE REASON FOR MOSES' DIVORCE FROM HIS WIFE.

Their interpretation of the passing affirms and verifies the true mission of the apostle and suggests to us his willingness, yea, his firm resolution, to fulfil it. When the righteous God (whose name is exalted) appeared to him in the stopping-place, and he was convinced that his mission is an arduous duty, requiring courage and resolution and freedom from other absorbing relations, he consented to let his wife and children alone solely in order that thus he might attend to his missionary duties. But his desire was not enough: he had no reason to violate the rights of the wife, if she were unwilling to consent, and all depended on her as it was necessary. Naturally he did not make an overture to her, as it was below his sense of duty, but she made one and asked her dismissal. Thus we read that when she acquainted him with her state, disclosing the impossibility of her stay with him, as it might have proved dangerous to her, the Apostle of God (who is exalted) understood her purpose and realized the necessity of granting her a divorce in accordance with her pleasure. So thus it is written, *Wayiref mimmenah*, that is, "He separated from her," according to the demand which she made at first with the words *Ky khetan dameem attah ly lammooolot*, which mean "Thou art a

spouse of blood to me for 'thy consent.'"¹ He therefore separated from her, and sent her back to her father, just at that time. If it were not for this passage, we would neither have known the date of her return to her father, nor the reasons for her dismissal. In fact it would not have been lawful unto the Apostle to have abandoned her and divorced her. Again, the word *watikroth*, that is "And she cut," is never used, in any of its forms, for the purpose of circumcision; on the contrary, all the commands and verbs used and applied to this ceremony are one of the forms of *hmool*. For God mentioned the ordinance of circumcision in eighteen passages, and all the words used with reference to its performance are derived from the infinitive *mool*, and there is nowhere the word *kritah*, nor *kar-too*, in all passages containing God's commands with reference to this ceremony. The truth is therefore very apparent to the careful observer of God's words used in this regard. Let then all prejudice and self-gratification be put aside, for the words of God are not self-contradictory: BLESSED BE HIS NAME FOREVER! AND EXALTED LET HIM BE ETERNALLY! AMEN.

¹The High Priest derives the infinitive *moolot* from a lost root, meaning to "consent," "to incline," which is found in another Semitic tongue with the same meanings. Compare the Hebrew *mool*, in the construction *el mool*, "towards," which, of course, is liable to other derivations.—Ta.

ARTICLE VII.

REFLECTIONS IN ROME.

BY THE REVEREND JAMES LINDSAY, D.D., KILMARNOCK,
SCOTLAND.

No city ministers so much to thought and meditation, to instruction and veneration, as does Rome. To every people and nation, indeed, the history and monuments of *Urbs Roma* minister in unique and signal ways. The associations of Rome are overpowering in character, as well as in number. They crowd upon the mind at every turn and step: here are colossal ruins of wrecked perfection; there are basilicas, palaces, and towers, that teem with suggestions of suffering, pathos, and heroism, beyond the power of words to describe: everywhere indelible traces of a past, peerless and unparalleled. The origin of Rome—the date of her foundation—is shrouded in mythological haze, which archaeologists and historians alike have in vain sought to penetrate. The life of the Eternal City has, historically, been one of change, from the time when the brooding East overcame the militant West, and that *imperium Romanum*, which to a Nietzsche is still type of all that is admirable, was broken, up to this day; its position, geologically, has been in the center of a volcanic region, the extinction of whose fires is comparatively recent. But no city could have been more fortunate in her site than Rome, with her seven Pliocene hills, suited as it preëminently was to the races that dwelt in and around her. Rome, city of cypress and palm, of pine and acanthus, of orange and oleander, of odoriferous blossom

and juicy vine, of pillared dome and silvery fountain, of portico and column and nymph and triton, of graceful arch, discrowned mausoleum, and colossal aqueduct, teems with life in the present no less than with glories of the past.

From the Janiculum Hill, the panoramic view is magnificent, reaching, as it does, over not only the Eternal City itself, but also over the broad undulating plain of the deserted Campagna, with the Etruscan Hills and Mount Soracte on the left, the Sabine Mountains in front, and the Alban Hills on the right. The ascent to the Janiculum is made by the Via Garibaldi, which, with the monument to Garibaldi, testifies to the honor in which this national hero is held, as does the Via Cavour to the city's appreciation of Cavour's genius. These twain, but not without Mazzini, were the regenerators of Italy. The Capitol, with its temples, carries abounding fascinating associations with the government and institutions of ancient Rome. The sacred buildings on the Capitoline Horace calls the *sacras arces*.¹ Capitol, Palatine, and Forum, where varied civilizations were cradled, and power, pomp, and pleasure bore sway, have all perished, leaving thought and memory to muse and learn from their decline and fall. The statue of Marcus Aurelius in the square of the Capitol, and the pillar of Aurelius in the Piazza Colonna, are pleasing memorials in Rome of the great and virtuous Emperor. The Capitoline Museum contains the notable statue termed the Dying Gaul, formerly called the Dying Gladiator; also, the Capitoline Venus, with the statues of orators, philosophers, and emperors, in rich profusion. The statues of the philosophers suggest how little philosophy ever lacked friends in Rome, albeit the Roman philosophisers gave themselves over mainly to spread the doctrines of the Greek philosophers in the Roman tongue. When Freeman visited

¹ Odes, l. 2, 3.

Rome, he wrote, "It is something indeed to see the Forum and Capitol"; but soon added, "I am most struck by the prodigious gap between old and new Rome; there is nothing like it elsewhere. Bating the walls and gates, which seem to be of all dates from Romulus to Pius IX., there is next to nothing for the whole time from Constantine to Nicholas V."¹ There is certainly some truth behind such reflections, and modern Rome is too modern, preserves or presents too little of antique stages that are not yet the most ancient. In this same spirit of "barbarian complacency," we find Mrs. Browning writing from Rome: "It's a palimpsest Rome, a watering-place over the antique, and I haven't taken to it as a poet should, I suppose."²

The Forum, where Cæsar ruled, Cicero spoke, and Horace reflected, where patrician and plebeian fought, still stands as symbol, even in its ruined splendor, of the greatest center of the political, religious, and social life of Rome. Heart of the city, the Forum remained until her fall. Of all that the Forum suggests, nothing perhaps is more inspiring than what is recalled by the honored legend of Quintus Curtius. With what feelings one may to-day contemplate the Forum, we find Carducci setting forth in his poem on Rome:—

"Salve, dea Roma! Chinato a i ruderi
del Fòro, lo seguo con dolci lacrime
e adoro i tuoi sparsi vestigi,
patria, diva, santa genitrice."

Of which Maud Holland's version may be taken:—

"Hail, Rome divine! bowed low to the rudiments
Here where the Forum slumbers, I, following
Thy scattered stones, bend o'er them weeping,
Country and goddess and holy mother."

Most characteristic and most imposing of all Rome's ruins is

¹ *Life and Letters*, vol. II. p. 76.

² *Life and Letters*, by Mrs. Sutherland Orr, p. 200.

the Colosseum. Roman in origin, the Colosseum is Greek in its triple style of architecture, and Jewish in the labor that carried it to completion. Its eighty-seven thousand spectators were accommodated in a building which, says Merivale, is of "the rich and warm travertine stone or encrusted with marble," and whose "most conspicuous parts shone with precious gems and metals." Here the pulses of the heart of Rome found fullest vent in incomparable horrors. The Colosseum remains to us, as the Forum does not. On this latter, the hand of time has not pressed lightly. The Colosseum has survived the *domus aurea*, or "Golden House," of Nero, and the Palaces of the Cæsars, and stands impressive and beautiful even in its measure of decay. Of Nero himself one thinks, in words of Renan, as "a painstaking stage hero, an operatic Emperor, music-mad, trembling before the pit, and making the pit tremble too." Mad enough he certainly was in his love of sensation. If the Forum recalls the courage of a Curtius, the Colosseum suggests the nobler sacrifice of the Syrian monk Telemachus, which led the Emperor Honorius to abolish the gladiatorial contests. Hard by is the Arch of Constantine, where, after his victory over Maxentius in 312, that Emperor declared in favor of Christianity. It was at least something to have a Constantine where had been a Galerius, for not even Gibbon, and still less Lecky, have been able to hide the suffering of those dread times. Mommsen truly says that "nowhere, perhaps, has the essential maxim of the slave state, that the rich man, who lives by the exertion of his slaves, is necessarily respectable, and the poor man, who lives by the labor of his hands, is necessarily vulgar, been recognised with so terrible a precision as the undoubted principle underlying all public and private intercourse." The harshness of the ruling conceptions had to be softened by Christianity ere the relations of slavery could be

mitigated, and finally abolished. Draper, in his "Intellectual Development of Europe," rightly enough remarks on the ruin of Rome being insured by her slave system ere yet the barbarians touched her, and certainly Rome knew nothing of Christianity's care for the individual, whom she treated, not as individual, but as thing. The view of Julia Wedgwood, in "The Moral Ideal," is not without an element of truth, that "obedience to steady systematic power" brings out valuable qualities in human nature, so that "when Virgil wrote, the virtues even of the slave were emerging into a development which Christianity was shortly to recognise and adopt."

Ancient nucleus and center of Rome was the famous Palatine Hill, with its Palaces of the Cæsars, signaling the pomp and luxury of the rulers of Rome. It was here, indeed, that Romulus founded the city of Rome in 753 B.C. What a city she was to become, in virtue of her aspiring genius, which led her to make merit and virtue her own, as Gibbon says, wherever she found them! What an absolute despotism was her government! What varied characters her Emperors bore, from the "exalted perfection" of an Augustus or a Hadrian down to "the dark, unrelenting Tiberius, the furious Caligula, the feeble Claudius, the profligate and cruel Nero, the beastly Vitellius, and the timid, inhuman Domitian"! At the foot of the Palatine rises the Triumphal Arch of Titus, commemorative of the defeat of the Jews in A.D. 70. In a hollow outside the Palatine stands the Arch of Janus, within what is known as the Forum Boarium, or cattle market. But it is impossible to speak in detail of a city whose every street seems to preserve some fragment, be it bronze or marble, of those ancient times. By a mighty leap we pass up to the Rome of to-day, wherein education, sanitation, pauperism, and such like matters have been improved or remedied to a degree that would have sur-

prised Sismondi, Macaulay, and Trollope, with other writers upon the remissness of Rome.

What a living part of Rome's history has been the massive mausoleum, now known as Castel S. Angelo, carrying thought back to the time when it served as tomb of Hadrian! It was here Gavazzi and others entered the dungeons of the Inquisition after the taking of Rome in 1870. Fronting this mausoleum is what Horace calls the *fluvium Tiberim*, the "tawny Tiber," of which Quevedo, as translated by Mrs. Hemans, says with regard to Rome, "Tiber alone survives":—

"Rome! of thine ancient grandeur all is past,
That seemed for years eternal framed to last,
Naught but the wave—a fugitive—remains."

But this poetic feeling, in a sense true, is not the whole truth, for Rome has a grandeur, in her antiquity, that is unique, and which *does* rather shadow forth

"The triumphs won by Latium, than by Time."

This, although Rome has grown too much a modern city, with fewer antique attractions than leisured people might wish.

The Pantheon, in its wondrously perfect state of preservation, was founded in the days of Augustus, and bears us back to the times of Trajan and of Hadrian, by the latter of whom it was restored and used as a Court of Justice. Dedicated it originally was to Mars and Venus, the ancestral gods of the Julian family. Theodosius the Great closed it in 315 as a Pagan temple, but in 606 the Emperor Phocas gave it to Boniface IV., who consecrated it in honor of the Virgin and the martyrs. Raphael and other great artists are buried in the Pantheon, and it has been used since 1879 as the mausoleum of the Italian kings, among whose remains are those of Victor Emmanuel as first king of Italy. This mention of the Pantheon recalls what Gibbon says about all forms of worship being considered by the people of ancient Rome as "equally

true," by the philosophers as "equally false," and by the magistrates as "equally useful." While we are speaking of worship, St. Peter's may be noted as altogether deserving Gibbon's description of it as "the most glorious structure that ever has been applied to the use of religion."¹ Its grandeur and magnificence almost baffle description. It stands not far from the base of the Janiculum. The piazza, with its Egyptian obelisk and fountains, and the basilica, are on splendid scale. The statue of Charlemagne at the vestibule's close, the glorious dome of Angelo in the interior, the canopies, the statues, the mosaics, the monuments, the paintings, all combine to make the structure the most imposing religious edifice in the world. But this magnificence is largely shared by many more of the chief churches in Rome.

The Forum of Trajan, designed by the Greek architect Apollodorus, lies magnificent in its ruins, its edifices having been wonderful, according to Ammianus. Trajan's column, composed solely of marble, rises on the north side of the basilica, and is covered with reliefs commemorating the Dacian wars of Trajan. Of the palaces of Rome, the Quirinal Palace, begun by Pope Gregory XIII. in 1574 on the top of the Quirinal Hill, is the only one of which we shall speak, as it has since 1870 been used as seat of the Italian court. Fronting the Palace, and in the center of the piazza, are the two statues of Castor and Pollux, standing by their horses. The inscriptions on their bases ascribe these statues to Phidias and Praxiteles. The high and sunny Pincio, formerly covered with vineyards and gardens, but now a delightful promenade, affords not only a fine prospect of the city, but also a favoring view of the fashion of Rome to-day. Here, also, one sees the splendid monument to Goethe presented by the German emperor Wilhelm II.,

¹ *Decline and Fall*, vol. vii. p. 469.

its finely sculptured figures representing scenes from (1) "Wilhelm Meister," (2) from "Iphigenia," and (3) from "Faust." The monument repays, in part, the debt which the genius of Goethe owed to Rome. "I reckon a second birthday," wrote Goethe, "a true new birth from the day that I entered Rome." Not the same man was the Goethe who left Rome in 1788 as the Goethe who entered it in 1786. "In Rome," he wrote, "I have for the first time found myself, for the first time come into harmony with myself and grown happy and rational." This obviously means that the reflective side of his being had come into happy and harmonious relation with the emotional and imaginative side of his nature. When speaking of his last month in Rome, he tells of the illuminated contemplation which he had learned in these terms: "In Rome, where we are constantly in the presence of the plastic art-works of the ancients, we feel, as in the presence of Nature, that we are compassed about by the Infinite, the Unsearchable."

Little wonder that Goethe so felt, for where shall one find so much concentrated beauty as in Rome? What though the beauty be so largely borrowed from Athens—from Greece—so long as the beauty is not only there, but absorbed and assimilated, adapted and appropriated, so that it has become, in various senses, all her own? Where else could one so fitly say, of all that savors of the vulgar—

"Odi profanum vulgus et arceo"?

Ideal art, but art subject to law and never fantastic, art in which imagination is controlled by intellectual sanity—such is the art of Rome. What grandeur of design marks the frescoes of Angelo, and the work of the superb colorist of Urbino! Angelo's grand fresco, "The Last Judgment," in the Sistine Chapel, with Christ sitting in the center as Judge of humanity, sur-

rounded by no fewer than three hundred figures—angels, saints, and demons—is a vast and peerless work—*monumentum perennius aere* of the artist. Angelo's powerful statue of Moses, the mighty lawgiver, stands in the Church of St. Peter in Chains, as a memorial of the great artist's conception of the mingled impetuosity, strength, and divine nobility of Israel's leader. Inharmonious and disproportionate as are the separate parts of the statue, the general effect is yet impressive. In the Picture Gallery of the Vatican one sees the world-famous work of Raphael entitled "The Transfiguration"; also, Raphael's "Madonna di Foligno," Domenichino's "Last Communion of St. Jerome," etc. Included among the Vatican art treasures are the famous Laocoön and his sons, the great Apollo Belvedere, considered the finest statue in the world, the statue of Meleager, with Etruscan and Egyptian antiquities in peerless variety and abundance. The Barberini Gallery, a small but good collection of paintings, contains the celebrated but unauthenticated "Beatrice Cenci" of Guido Reni, also Andrea del Sarto's "Madonna," etc. The large Borghese Gallery has many fine sculptures and paintings: among the former, Bernini's "David with the Sling," and his "Apollo and Daphne," Canova's Pauline Borghese, sister of Napoleon I., as Venus: among the latter, Raphael's "Entombment," Titian's "Sacred and Profane [or rather, Artless and Sated] Love," Guercino's "Return of the Prodigal Son," and the same subject by Bonifazio; also Correggio's "Danaë," S. Botticelli's "Madonna," etc. One cannot forget that it was in the surroundings of the Borghese Gardens that Goethe wrote the most wildly fantastic scene in "Faust"—that which describes the mad humors of the witch's kitchen. In Rome, too, his "Iphigenia" was re-handled. The Casino Rospigliosi contains Guido Reni's masterpiece, the "Aurora," on its ceiling, together with paintings

by Domenichino, Poussin, etc. Of the indebtedness of Rome to Greek art and ideal we have already spoken, but this indebtedness must not be exaggerated in the manner of certain recent writers, nor must it be forgotten how much Greece, in her turn, owed to the East. But, if Greece set her own stamp on all she borrowed from the East, so, too, did Rome set her own seal on all she inherited from Greece. The wonders of the East came to Hellas alike by land and by sea. But Greek genius asserted itself, and Greece at length came to her own, thanks to her instinctive yearnings for reason and beauty combined. It is necessary to remember in this connection what Finlay has said, in his "Greece under the Romans," that "the Romans were never very deeply imbued with a passionate admiration for Grecian art," notwithstanding that "the most celebrated works of art" were often transported to Rome, "as much on account of their celebrity as their merit." Fortunate for Greece was the inferior enthusiasm of the Romans for art, as she was less despoiled of her paintings and statues—was, in fact, saved from what might well have been a general confiscation of her art-treasures. As it was, Rome, even when most victorious, had enough to learn from her.

Passing out of Rome, on the Appian Way, or queen of roads, are seen the Tomb of the Scipios, the Columbaria or tombs of freedmen, and the Arch of Drusus, with the city walls built by Aurelianus on the course of the octroi. So, too, on the right (driving from Rome) are the imposing Baths of Caracalla, unequalled as a pleasure resort for the works of Art they contained. The Via Appia affords a splendid view of the Campagna, and of the ruins of the ancient tombs and the aqueducts built by the Emperor Claudius, with the beautiful blue Alban Hills as background. Of that rich, antique world, Matthew Arnold has yet said—

"On that hard Pagan world disgust
And secret loathing fell:
Deep weariness and sated lust
Made human life a hell.

"In his cool hall, with haggard eyes,
The Roman noble lay;
He drove abroad, in furious guise,
Along the Appian way;

"He made a feast, drank fierce and fast,
And crown'd his hair with flowers—
No easier nor no quicker pass'd
The impracticable hours."

On the Via Appia, and shaded by cypresses, are the Catacombs of St. Callixtus, perhaps the most interesting and remarkable of all the Catacombs. They contain, among other interesting relics, the Tomb of St. Cecilia, and two sarcophagi with the remains of the deceased still in them. These early burial-places have made "Roma Sotteranea" a source of great interest, and even fascination, to a long line of scholars and explorers. Many valuable inscriptions, paintings, and symbols have been discovered in the Catacombs within the last half-century. Tacitus tells of the "huge multitude" (*ingens multitudo*), as his "Annals" term it, of those whom Nero sent down to death, to divert odium from himself. It is not easy to reconcile the simplicity of early faith and practice, as evidenced in the Catacombs, with the complexity and splendor of ecclesiastical Rome to-day. This, even though we may admire what Bryce, in his "Holy Roman Empire," calls "the warmth of tone, the repose, the stateliness of the churches of modern Rome." Earlier in the Appian Way, but on the left, one sees the "Domine, Quo Vadis" Church, with its legend of St. Peter, which Michael Angelo took for the subject of his Christ in the Santa Maria sopra Minerva.

The varied magnificence of Rome lies in no material great-

ness, but in such superb manifestations of will and intellect as we have described. The nobility, vastness, and culture of Rome make her no less a training-school for the world to-day than she was in the days of Winckelmann and of Goethe. But from Rome to-day it is a far cry to that antique Rome in which we find those first developments of personality, which are, in truth, the ultimate foundation of Art. The triumph of Christianity over the old Roman Empire—so astonishing in the eyes of a Rousseau, no less than of a Lamennais or a Pascal—was made possible by the cruelty and the corruption of the ancient Roman civilization. Classic polytheism had become as the baseless fabric of a vision, for the old Paganism was as good as dead. The Stoicism of an Aurelius, an Epictetus, or a Seneca, was utterly incapable, in its impotent disdain, of ameliorating the existing condition of mankind. The rude art of the Catacombs was already radiant with higher hopes and more glorious happiness than had entered the mind or imagination of pagan Rome. A religion that could deify a Caligula, a Nero, a Domitian, a Commodus, could hardly fail to fall into contempt, but Rome traced her own decline to Christianity. as a religion of peace, inimical to the existing government of the Roman Empire. The weight of wealth, wisdom, pride, and prejudice was against Christianity, making her steady and triumphant progress a truly marvelous phenomenon. But Christianity which, in breaking the power of the *imperium Romanum*, broke the power of the strongest, triumphed over Paganism just because of its inherent and limitless capacity for growth and self-renewal, and because it was the religion of strength that had arisen out of weakness and helplessness.

ARTICLE VIII.

ESSAYS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM.

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
LINCOLN'S INN, LONDON.

II.

INSPIRITED by the remarkable results of their labors on the narrative of the plagues, the critics turn with zeal to the crossing of the Red Sea. "The triple narrative of the plagues," writes Mr. Carpenter, "raises the presumption that the passage of the Red Sea was also related by all the three documents J, E, and P." (Vol. ii. p. 99, note on Exodus xiii. 17.) The rest of this note contains nothing that need detain us, being devoted to phrases like "make strong the heart" and similar matters, but verse 21 brings us to the first appearance of the pillar of cloud, and this is one of the main arguments for the partition of the narrative of the middle books. The Glory and the position of the Ark and the Tent of Meeting are necessarily involved in any discussion of the Cloud, and we purpose therefore to dispose of these topics without further delay.

THE CLOUD.

"Three representations of the divine presence in the cloud [writes Mr. Carpenter, on Ex. xiii. 21] are to be found in the Hexateuch. In P it covers the Dwelling at its consecration Ex xi 34 ff Num ix 15 ff, and remains over the Tent of Meeting until it is time for the camp to be moved, when it is taken up. A second set of passages also connects it with the Tent of Meeting, but places it at the entrance, where it comes down in the form of a pillar and remains in converse with Moses Ex xxxiii 7 f Num xii 5 cp Deut xxxi 15: reasons will be given hereafter for ascribing these to E. But in the

text 21 [i.e. Ex. xiii. 21] nothing has yet been said of any sanctuary; the pillar with its twofold aspect by day or night serves another function, that of guidance and protection. In xiv 19 two symbols, the angel of Elohim, and the pillar, have been combined by R. As the 'angel of Elohim' naturally belongs to E, the guardian pillar must be regarded as the equivalent in J." (Vol. ii. p. 100.)

That passage may serve as an introduction to the higher critical case. In reply we intend to prove the following points: (1) It is not true that in P the cloud first makes its appearance at the erection of the Dwelling. On the contrary it is found before then and *in the same position* as in J. (2) The Lord comes down in a cloud in J as well as in E, but in both documents this is only on certain occasions. (3) Otherwise E locates the cloud in exactly the same position as J. (4) The discrepancy between P and JE can be manufactured only by the help of the redactor.

The pillar of cloud in Exodus xiii. 21 and 22 (J) really calls for no remark. The passage is entirely suitable to the first appearance of the cloud, and gives the necessary explanation of its presence.¹ The next passage is xiv. 19-20. We begin by printing the portion assigned to E continuously: "And the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; . . . and came between the camp of Egypt and the camp of Israel; and there was the cloud and the darkness." This at once disposes of Mr. Carpenter's statement that "two symbols, the angel of Elohim, and the pillar, have been combined by R," for we see that when E has been disentangled it still recognizes the cloud either in addition to or as covering the angel. The representation is in fact exactly the same as in J when we remember that Hebrew thought did not always draw a sharp distinction between God and his angel,

¹ It will, however, hereafter be argued that these verses should be followed immediately by Exodus xxxiii. 7-11, a passage which is at present out of place.

the latter being regarded as a manifestation of Him. Many commentators think there is some corruption in verse 20; but, unless Mr. Carpenter can prove that the angel did not appear in the cloud,—and he is wise enough not even to suggest this,—the attempt to establish a discrepancy between J and E breaks down. It must be conceded that these two documents display precisely the same conception of the position of the cloud at this juncture.

The next passage is Exodus xvi. 10 (P). On this Mr. Carpenter, in his note on verse 2, writes as follows:—

“But the story implies the existence of the Levitical Dwelling with the ark containing the Sacred Testimony 34. It is not till the Dwelling is completed that ‘the Glory of the Lord’ (10) first appears in the cloud cp xl 34 ff. . . . Nor can the narrative be relieved of this anachronism by viewing 33 f as a later addition. The phrase in 9 ‘come near before the Lord’ similarly describes attendance at the sanctuary cp Lev lx 5 xvi 1 Num xviii 22. The story, then, in its present form implies the existence of a centre of worship which is not yet constructed, and must have been transposed to its present place from a later stage.” (Vol. II. pp. 104, 105.)

We confess that in reading the higher critics we often feel how much their writings would gain in accuracy if they were to be “redacted” by somebody who treated them on the principle which they apply to the Pentateuch. It makes our mouth water to think how many of Mr. Carpenter’s most questionable statements could be rendered quite defensible by such simple expedients as the judicious insertion of negative adverbs. Here is an instance. Suppose that for “implies” we write “does not imply” (or, better still, “excludes”), the first portion of the last sentence becomes absolutely accurate. For what does the chapter say? Moses tells Aaron to command the congregation to come near before the Lord. If this narrative implied the existence of the sanctuary, it is obvious that this must have directed their attention to the center of the camp. But it did

nothing of the sort. The Israelites—who appear not to have been informed that they were in a misplaced passage of P—were perverse enough to behave just as if they had been living in J or E. As yet the only symbol of the Divine presence was the cloud which went before them and had not yet removed to the Dwelling. Accordingly we are told that they looked in the direction of the wilderness (ver. 10). They seem indeed to have interpreted the command to come near before the Lord as referring to the visible symbol of his presence. Worse, still, their perversity was rewarded by seeing the glory appear in the cloud. And Mr. Carpenter does not even consign “the wilderness” to a redactor!

Dr. George Buchanan Gray does not take the matter so quietly. On page 154 of his volume on Numbers, he peremptorily orders his readers to read “tabernacle” for “wilderness.” No reason is assigned for the command—we think wisely.

It will be observed that in the passage we have quoted Mr. Carpenter asserts that the story “must have been transposed to its present place from a later stage.” Similarly Dr. Gray (Numbers, p. 86) says: “Ex. xvi 6–10 is a misplaced narrative.” We have no prejudice against transpositions—indeed we hope to propose some on our own account hereafter: but we would suggest to these gentlemen that before putting forward their schemes in future they should examine the chapters that they desire to transpose for *indicia* of place. In the present instance the first verse contains an important date—the fifteenth day of the second month. P, to whom this is attributed, does not bring the children of Israel to Sinai until the third month (xix. 1). It follows that he cannot have intended this story to relate to a subsequent period. That the children of Israel should have begun to live on manna very

soon after their departure from Egypt is so obviously in accordance with the necessities of the case that nobody would ever have questioned the position of the narrative but for the desire to manufacture contradictions.

It should also be noticed that Mr. Carpenter's allegation that "it is not till the dwelling is completed that the 'Glory of the LORD' first appears in the cloud" is quite incapable of being supported. The glory is found in the cloud over Sinai (xxiv. 16).

The reference to verse 33 which commands the deposit of a pot of manna in the sanctuary offers no criterion of the date to which the narrative of the earlier portion of the chapter relates. It is easily conceivable that either the original historian or (more probably) a subsequent editor should have here adopted a topical order and disposed of the divine command relating to the manna.

As Dr. Gray has been mentioned, we may pause to correct some of his statements. He writes (Numbers, p. 113) of the cloud that, "in both E and P, as distinguished from J, it is regularly associated with the tabernacle." We have seen that this is not true of E before Sinai, and the present passage (as also Ex. xxiv.) proves the same of P. On page 86 we read: "The cloud, according to P, first appeared at Sinai. . . . Before reaching Sinai, the Israelites marched according to the commandment of the LORD, Ex. xvii 1; such definite direction they still required; for the cloud in P does not, as in J (Ex. xiii 22), move at the head of the whole host to show the way." This statement as to the position of the cloud in P on the march is scarcely in harmony with Numbers ix. 17: "And in the place where the cloud abode, there the children of Israel encamped." This would naturally be understood as meaning that the cloud was in front during the march.

After Exodus xvi. the cloud is next mentioned in connection with the stay at Sinai. In xix. 9 (E) we read: "Behold, I come unto thee in a thick cloud," in verse 16 the same writer speaks of a thick cloud, and in xx. 21 he refers to it as thick darkness. We draw special attention to this, as it disproves the allegation of Dr. G. B. Gray (*Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 3777) that "P differs . . . from both E and J with regard to the form of the phenomenon."

Exodus xxiv. 15b brings us to what the critics desire to regard as the first mention of the cloud in P—for it must be remembered that Exodus xvi. is "misplaced." P not unnaturally begins by speaking of "the cloud" as if it had been mentioned before. Mr. Carpenter offers no explanation of this: but to most readers it will seem that the article here refers to the last mention, which happens to be in E.

In Exodus xxxiii. 9 (E) we find the pillar of cloud descending, but exactly the same conception appears in xxxiv. 5 (J), and in P we also read of the cloud's rising and descending. In xxxiv. J is actually thoughtless enough to speak of the cloud—not the "pillar." Yet Dr. Gray writes in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*: "Deuteronomy i 33 is dependent on J, though the term pillar is not used" (col. 3776). In xl. 34 a late priestly writer once more speaks of *the* cloud, and tells how it came to occupy a position in the center of the camp. So that, if the narrative be read continuously, it appears that J, E and P all agree, and that no discrepancy can be proved.

We shall consider together Numbers x. 34: "And the cloud of the LORD was over them by day, when they set forward from the camp," and Numbers xiv. 14: "For thou, O LORD, art seen face to face, and thy cloud standeth over them, and thou goest before them, in a pillar of cloud by day, and in a pillar of fire by night." Mr. Carpenter deals with these two

passages, which contain precisely the same idea, in the following manner: The first is consigned to a late priestly stratum. The note informs us that "the description of the cloud as 'over' the advancing Israelites at once separates this statement from the narrative of J in which it is conceived as going before them xiv 14b Ex xiii 21 as a pillar. In P, on the other hand, it is always above them without definite form cp ix 17 ff." We have already seen the cloud descending in J—which implies elevation—and we have also found J (and D based on J) speaking of the cloud without the word "pillar." As to xiv. 14 Mr. Carpenter assigns the bulk of the verse to R^{je} (i.e. the redactor of J and E), but invokes another redactor, R^p (i.e. the priestly redactor), to redact the earlier redactor, and so disposes of the words "and thy cloud standeth over them," alleging, in the note *ad loc.*, that "this clause seems due to a reminiscence of the account of the Dwelling in the midst of the camp and the cloud above it." Yet it should be tolerably obvious that "standing" and "going before" are mutually exclusive, and refer to the people in camp and on the march respectively.

We must just mention that in a late stratum of E (Num. xii. 5) the LORD comes down in a pillar of cloud, but in xii. 10 and xi. 25, "the cloud" is spoken of in the same stratum without the word pillar. We need not linger over any other passage.

To sum up. As to the form: Both J and E speak sometimes of the pillar and sometimes of the cloud. In Exodus xix. (E) the cloud can scarcely have been in the form of a pillar, and the representation is precisely the same as that found more frequently in P. It is not difficult to understand that the shape varied with the occasion in the Pentateuch as a whole, as it certainly did in E. As to the position: P and J and E place the cloud in exactly the same position before Sinai. At

Sinai it appears to have been in the first instance over the mountain in all the documents, but it descends sometimes for Moses. Accordingly in all three documents it is high up on normal occasions, that is above the Israelites. When the Tabernacle is erected it takes its normal position in the center of the camp over the sanctuary. In P and J it normally precedes the Israelites on the march after Sinai, but there is no sufficient indication of the exact form it assumes in P. In all three documents it is normally high up after Sinai, but in E it sometimes descends. We have seen it doing the same in J, and it will be found that it behaves likewise in Leviticus xvi. 2 (P). But on different occasions the descents occur in different places. It is of course suggested that in E the Tent of Meeting stood outside the camp after Sinai, and that would place the cloud in a different position, but we shall shortly see that this critical theory cannot be supported either.¹ A division into discrepant sources can of course be effected by the process of tearing the Pentateuch up and dividing the shreds between documents, redactors, and redactors of redactors; but this applies equally to any narrative in the world. On the other hand we are bound to point out that the statements of Messrs. Carpenter and Gray on the topics involved are marked by a recklessness and an inaccuracy which may doubtless be paralleled with supreme ease from almost any publication of the Wellhausen school, but are elsewhere not common in literature that professes to be scholarly.

THE GLORY.

This is so closely related to the cloud that we take it next. Dr. Gray writes thus on page 154 of his commentary on Num-

¹ On the other hand, it will be argued that before Sinai there was a tent of meeting which was frequently placed outside the camp, and that it is to this period that Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 relates.

bers: "According to P, *the glory of the Lord* was a fiery appearance manifesting the divine presence. . . . P's conception of the glory of the LORD is markedly different from that of other Hexateuchal sources." On page 158, in reference to xiv. 21 (redactor of JE), he adds: "Here and in the next verse, *the glory of the Lord* is the revelation of His character and power in history." Yet something very like the latter conception occurs in P also. In Exodus xxix. 43 (P) the Hebrew has: "And it [Greek and Syriac "I"] shall be sanctified by my glory." This can hardly be the fiery appearance.¹ On the other hand, in Exodus xxxiii. 18, 22 (secondary stratum of J) it cannot be claimed that the glory is a "revelation of God's character and power in history." This contention, therefore, goes the way of Dr. Gray's other assertions.

We pass to a more important matter.

THE POSITION OF THE ARK.

Mr. Carpenter has slightly modified the language of one of his observations on this topic in the "Composition of the Hexateuch" (1902), which is a second edition of Volume I. of his Hexateuch. We therefore quote the later work. The passages we have to examine are three in number.

(1) Of J:—"The ark is mentioned Num x 33, and appears (contrary to E's view of the sanctuary chap xii §2e) to have been habitually guarded in the centre of the camp Num xiv 44." (Composition, p. 183.)

(2) Of E:—"The Mosala sanctuary, however, is of a different order. It is a tent, fit for the conditions of nomad life in the desert, pitched outside the camp xxxiii 7 ff, bearing the name of the Tent

¹ We think the same applies to Exodus xvi. 7. The glory of the LORD is there manifested in the morning by the manna. Perhaps verses 9-12 should stand before 6-8. In that case they would owe their present position to the misunderstanding of somebody who confused the "glory" of verse 7 with the fiery "glory" of verse 10, and therefore thought that verse 7 was a prediction of the occurrence related in verse 10.

of Meeting. . . . It was no doubt intended to enshrine the ark, which in its turn held the sacred stones." (Composition, p. 209=Hexateuch, vol. 1. p. 114. This is the passage referred to in the last extract as chap xli §2e.)

(3) "The Tent of Meeting is still outside long after the camp order has been established Num xi 24-30 xli 4. It is in harmony with this representation of the isolation of the sanctuary that the ark does not travel in the midst of the tribes, but in front of them x 33." (Composition, p. 49=Hexateuch, vol. 1. p. 30.)

Now unfortunately Numbers x. 33 belongs to J, who, according to extract (1), represented the ark as being "habitually guarded in the centre of the camp." Therefore its position on the march is no criterion of its position in camp.

In treating of the position of the Ark we take its position on the march first. In the Pentateuch there are two passages in J. The first is Numbers x. 33: "The ark went before them three days' journey, to seek out a resting place for them." The second is the passage (verses 35 f.) where we are told what Moses said when it set forward and when it rested. Most modern commentators think—no doubt rightly—that the words "three days' journey" (in the second part of x. 33) are due to dittography, and should be expelled from the text. This is borne out by the second passage, as Moses would not have been in a position to say anything if the Ark had been three days' journey distant. Then reading 34 ff. continuously it becomes clear that the Ark led the way with the cloud over it. It is alleged by Dr. Gray (Numbers, p. 93) that in verse 21 (P) "the ark is carried in the midst of the people," but his reference does not support his statement, particularly as he insists that in that verse מקדש cannot mean "sanctuary," but must be rendered "holy things." Certainly any fair reader finding the statement "And the Kohathites set forward, bearing the holy things and the ark went before them to seek out a resting place for them," would not infer an incon-

sistency. He might hold that the ark was not here included in the expression "holy things," or he might infer that this position of the ark was abnormal, and intended only for the three days' journey. And he would be strengthened in this view by a further fact, a fact that even a whole army of indefatigable redactors could not eliminate. Perhaps, after what we have seen of the higher critical methods, some readers may feel tempted to ask whether there is anything for which one or more redactors cannot be held responsible. We think there is; for it happens that the whole book of Joshua has slipped from the minds of Messrs. Carpenter and Gray! We turn to Joshua iii. f. Omitting a few harmonists and glossators, this narrative is adroitly divided between J, E, a Deuteronomic reviser and a late priestly stratum; and, alack-a-day! all these four separate individuals treat of the Ark in precisely the same manner. And none of these sources—not even P^s, who ought surely to support our critics in a matter of this kind—knows anything of Dr. Gray's position for the Ark. After this it is scarcely necessary to add that Joshua vi. has also been neglected by our commentators, but it too shows clearly that the Ark (which was a portable object) was not always or necessarily in the same position, even in JE.

It is therefore quite impossible to manufacture any discrepancy between the various sources with regard to the position of the Ark on the march.

We turn to its position in the camp. It appears from the passages cited by Mr. Carpenter, and also Joshua vii. 6, that J locates the ark in the camp. So does P (Ex. xl. 20 ff.). And E? Except on the march he is never permitted to mention the ark at all, either in the Pentateuch or Joshua. The only "evidence" that in his view the ark was kept outside the camp is the fact that when Moses (in Ex. xxxiii.) pitched the Tent

there *before the ark had come into existence*, he did not take the ark with him. And indeed the Hebrew text of the passage expressly states that Moses pitched the Tent for himself (not for the ark). Probably that is why Mr. Carpenter writes that the Tent pitched outside "was no doubt intended to enshrine the ark." We have observed that a really good higher critic who has no evidence for what he wishes to believe habitually asserts that it was "doubtless" so, or "must have been" so, or uses some other similar phrase to supply the lack of evidence. But as E in Joshua represents the ark as being under the charge of priests (not of Moses or his minister), it is clear that he did not conceive of Moses as taking the non-existent ark outside the camp with him. It therefore appears that here again the critical case breaks down hopelessly under examination.

THE TENT OF MEETING.

Mr. Carpenter's case on this is stated as follows:—

"In Ex xxxiii 7 ff Num xi 24 ff xli 4 ff the Tent of Meeting is pitched outside the camp. The first of these passages assumes the existence of the tent and describes the sacred usage connected with it: the others supply incidental confirmation by depicting incidents which happened at its door. With these conceptions Dt xxxi 14 f is in harmony. It is a singular circumstance that (in the present text) the first mention of the place of this Tent Ex xxxiii 7 ff represents it as in actual use before it was made. It is a part of the sanctuary which is to be constructed xxvii 21 xxviii 43 xxix 4 ff xxx 16 ff xxxi 7; but its preparation is not begun till after the second sojourn of Moses on the Mount xxxiv, its erection being solemnly completed xl 2-33. Must it not be admitted that the two long corresponding sections xxv-xxx and xxxv-xl together with Num ii-iii present an account which is entirely independent of the story in Ex xxxiii 7 ff and inconsistent with it?" (Vol. i. pp. 51-52.)

Professor Van Hoonacker, a great and singularly acute scholar, has suggested a series of transpositions on page 146 of his "*Sacerdoce lévitique*," with a view to removing the diffi-

culty. On testing his theory we found it unworkable; but, out of respect for him, we begin by setting it out, together with the facts that disprove it. In the first column of the following table we give the order suggested by the Professor, in the second the indications of the places at which the various incidents occurred, and in the third the parallel data of Numbers xxxiii. It will be seen that columns 2 and 3 disprove column 1.

PROF. VAN HOONACKER'S PROPOSED ORDER.	INDICATIONS OF PLACE IN THE PASSAGES NAMED.	DATA OF NUM. XXXIII.
Ex xv	ver 27 people come to Elim and encamp there	Num xxxiii ver 9 reach Elim
Ex xxxiii 7-11	No indication of place except what may be gleaned from the Tent and its position	ver 10 Red Sea
Ex xvi 1	The people leave Elim and come to the wilderness of Sin between Elim and Sinai	ver 11 wilderness of Sin ver 12 Dophkah
Num xi 1-32 (less 6b-9 assigned to a redactor)	Taberah (ver 3)	ver 13 Alush
Num xii	Apparently the scene is Hazeroth which the people leave (ver 16) for the wilderness of Paran	
Ex xvii and further (unspecified) narratives leading to	ver 1. The Israelites leave the wilderness of Sin and pitch in Rephidim: 6 Horeb mentioned: 7 the place called Massah and Meribah	ver 14 Rephidim no water to drink ver 15 wilderness of Sinai
Num x	ver 12 leave the wilderness of Sinai for the wilderness of Paran: verse 33	

PROF. VAN HOONACKER'S PROPOSED ORDER.	INDICATIONS OF PLACE IN THE PASSAGES NAMED.	DATA OF NUM. XXXIII.
	set forward from the Mount of the Lord, three days' journey	
Ex xvi 2-36	No place named, but (ver 11) the cloud is not in the centre of the camp (see <i>supra</i> on the cloud)	
Num xi 33-4	The place called Kibroth-hattaavah	ver 16 Kibroth-hattaavah
Num xiii ff	ver 3 wilderness of Paran	ver 17 Hazeroth

Numbers xi. 35 appears to be left out of the scheme altogether.

Now apart from the unsatisfactory treatment of this verse and Numbers xi. 6b-9 (assigned to a redactor), it is evident that the scheme breaks down through the impossible order of the places. Stated continuously they are as follows: Elim, wilderness of Sin, Taberah, Hazeroth, wilderness of Paran, then suddenly the Israelites leave the wilderness of Sin for Rephidim. Next they leave the wilderness of Sinai and set out for the wilderness of Paran, then the cloud is not in the center of the camp (pointing to pre-Sinaitic days), then Kibroth-hattaavah, and lastly Paran. And if the order proposed breaks down for internal reasons, it is also difficult to reconcile with the external testimony of Numbers xxxiii. We are, therefore, justified in looking for the solution elsewhere. But it is highly characteristic of the stimulating quality of Professor Van Hoonacker's work that the view which we have to propound grew out of a train of thought which was originally suggested to us by the very note in which the above transpositions are put forward: and we desire to acknowledge the bene-

fit we have derived from his work in this as in other instances.¹

In dealing with this question, it is important that we should understand exactly what the case is that we have to meet. It is said that in E the tent is outside the camp, but in P (and probably J) it is in the center of the camp. Bound up with this are statements that in E Joshua is the custodian of the sanctuary, that E (in contrast to J and P) locates the Ark outside the camp, that the cloud is in a different position, and so on. We have already disposed of all these subsidiary allegations, and are therefore free to consider the main proposition in all its nakedness. Is it the case that E represents that Tent which elsewhere stands in the center of the camp as being pitched outside it?

We begin by eliminating Deuteronomy xxxi. 14 f. (E), which, according to Mr. Carpenter, is "in harmony with" the representation attributed to E. If that passage be examined,

¹ We wish, however, to add a few remarks on one or two other points.

(a) As to the Taberah incident. Professor Van Hoonacker here relies on Deuteronomy ix. 22, where Taberah, Massah, Kibroth-hattaavah, are mentioned in the order named. It may be questioned whether this is sufficient evidence to warrant a transposition at all. If it be, perhaps the Deuteronomy names are in the wrong order, not the Numbers narratives. Assuming, however, that Deuteronomy be held to evidence derangement in the latter, we think the transposition should affect only xl. 1-13. The episode of the quails in this chapter stands in intimate relation with the name Kibroth-hattaavah (ver. 33), which the Deuteronomy verse dissociates from Taberah. Hence the very passage which is advanced for the transposition of verses 1-3 affords an argument for retaining the present position of verses 4-35. (b) As to the seventy elders: Professor Van Hoonacker thinks that Exodus xxiv. 1 assumes the narrative of Numbers xl. 16 ff. We cannot agree. Indeed, we think that if, at the time Moses ascended the mountain, seventy elders had already been invested with a portion of his spirit, the arrangement by which Aaron and Hur were intrusted with judicial business would probably have been unnecessary, or at any rate would have utilized the seventy in some way. In Exodus the elders are present to rep-

it will be observed that it contains nothing in any way suggestive of a position outside the camp. We have already pointed out that it is not "in harmony with" a theory making Joshua the permanent resident attendant of the Tent: and there is not a syllable in the passage that is decisive of the location of the Tent. That may therefore be left out of consideration.

Turning now to Exodus xxxiii. 7, we read that "Moses used to take *the* Tent [Greek and Syriac, *his* tent] and pitch it for himself [Greek omits "for himself"] without the camp, afar off from the camp; and he called it, The Tent of Meeting." Now in Hebrew this can mean that Moses used to take *a* tent (cp. Deut. xv. 17; and see Strack on this passage, or Driver on 1 Sam. xix. 13). From the latter note the following may be cited: "The garment [i.e. in 1 Sam. xiv. 13, where the Hebrew and R.V. have "the," A.V. "a"], the cord [i.e. in Josh. ii. 15, Heb. "the," A.V. and R.V. "a"], the pots [i.e. 2 Kings x. 7, Heb. "the," A.V. and R.V. "in baskets"] are each not *represent* the people—nothing more: in Numbers they are chosen to assist Moses in dealing with the people, though it is true that their business was not chiefly judicial. (c) As to the manna: Numbers xi. 4 ff. is much more vivid and natural if the people had been on the manna diet for a considerable time than if the narrative be placed at the beginning of the wanderings. Moreover, the people have no obvious means of subsistence till after Sinai in this arrangement of the text. (d) As to the quails: Attention should be drawn to the dates. We shall discuss these more fully when we consider this chapter of Numbers. For the moment we note the following facts: The first flight of quails occurred on or soon after the fifteenth day of the second month of the first year (Ex. xvi. 1). The second flight must have been at the same season of the year, for the Israelites left Sinai on the twentieth of the second month of the second year (x. 11), and appear to have arrived at Kibroth-hattaavah a few days later. The details of the Mosaic calendar are, of course, unknown to us: but it is reasonably clear that in both narratives the same season is contemplated, and as the Exodus fell in the early spring it is reasonably clear (*pace* Dr. Gray), that "in the original source this story was referred to the spring season." (See, further, Gray, Numbers, pp. 117 f.)

determined by some antecedent reference or allusion, but are fixed in the writer's mind, and defined by the article, by *the purpose to which it is, or is to be, put.*" Dr. Driver then cites various examples, including Numbers xxi. 9 on "*a* [Heb and R.V. "*the*"] pole"; Judges vii. 13 "*a* [Heb and R.V. "*the*"] tent." Finally, he adds that "a difference between Hebrew and English idiom must here be recognized."

Once this rendering comes into view, it becomes evident that the difference of reading between the Greek and the Hebrew does not cover any important difference of meaning. Whether Moses took *his* tent, or whether he took *a* tent and pitched it *for himself*, does not matter much from the point of view of the sense conveyed. As at present advised we prefer the Hebrew text, but either will serve equally well. Neither in any way suggests the Dwelling, which had not yet been constructed. And on any view of the passage it is extraordinarily improbable that Moses should take the Tent that sheltered the ark and pitch it (without the ark) *for himself*, leaving the ark bared and unguarded, which is the only case the critics can set up on the Hebrew text.

To this Tent those who wished to seek the LORD used to repair: and at this stage it becomes necessary to consider another passage of E, which contains a similar representation, but with important differences. Exodus xviii. narrates certain incidents that happened before Moses left Sinai. It is not at present in its proper position chronologically. We learn (ver. 5) that Jethro came unto Moses into the wilderness, where he was encamped at the mount of God (cp. xix. 2), and Deuteronomy i. 6-19 appears to support this. Mr. Carpenter places it "among the last of the Horeb scenes," and verse 16 would certainly fit in well enough as a statement made after the Sinaitic covenant. Moreover, Numbers xii. 1 becomes much more

intelligible if the Cushite woman had only recently arrived in the camp, as would be the case if Jethro's visit fell shortly before the departure from Horeb,¹ and the language of Deuteronomy i. suits this date. Now it is noticeable that in this narrative, referring apparently to a later time than the events recorded in Exodus xxxiii., Moses does not sit in a tent outside the camp. The differences are striking. In Exodus xxxiii. 7, Moses goes out to the Tent: in Exodus xviii. 13 he sits to judge the people. In Exodus xxxiii. 8 ff. all the people rise and stand at the doors of their tents, looking after Moses. When they see the cloud standing at the door of the tent, they worship. In xviii. 13b, 14, they stand about Moses from the morning unto the evening. It will be observed that both passages alike belong to E, and both narrate the practice whereby the people consulted the Divine through Moses. It would appear, therefore, that in the interval separating the events re-

¹ Both Mr. Carpenter and Dr. Gray regard the words "for he had married a Cushite woman" as a gloss. With this view we heartily concur. Our present Pentateuch contains *variorum* notes: and we think that, after the existence of the North Arabian Cush had been completely forgotten, some reader who thought Cushite meant Ethiopian added these words as an explanatory note. It is interesting to note how the narrative gains in vividness when the words are removed. Dr. Gray (Numbers, p. 121) writes: "In its present position, it is true, the clause itself, apart from any particular interpretation of Cushite, reasonably implies that the marriage was recent." We would substitute the word "grievance" for "marriage"; and we think that with this alteration the point is well taken. Although the marriage was not recent, Zipporah's presence in the camp and her contact with Miriam and Aaron could then have been of no long duration if she had only arrived shortly before the departure from Sinai. The language used, "the Cushite woman" instead of her name, faithfully reflects the method by which Miriam and Aaron sought to arouse prejudice against her, for union with Midianitish women was perfectly legal in the Mosaic age (Num. xxxi. 18; Deut. xxi. 10-14, etc.) for all Israelites except the high priest (Lev. xxi. 14). Unhappily it has always been only too easy to rouse the feeling of any people against foreigners.

corded the practice had changed. The reason is not far to seek. The sanctuary had been erected, and Moses sat at the door of what had now become the Tent of Meeting, where he could commune with God (Ex. xxv. 22) should need arise (Num. vii. 89; Lev. xxiv. 12; Num. xxvii. 2 and 5 (all P)). Thus the position of Moses when sitting as a judge in E supports and in turn is supported by the statements of P. The tent which figures as the Tent of Meeting in Exodus xxxiii. was disused after the erection of the sanctuary in accordance with the instructions of Exodus xxv., and the very document which tells of the location of this earlier Tent outside the camp plainly shows us that the business which had once been transacted in it was dealt with at a later date in a more central position.

It only remains to consider Numbers xi. and xii., where it is said that the Tent once more stands without the camp. We begin with the latter of these two chapters, as in this way we can use the involuntary assistance of Dr. Gray in destroying the theory he so firmly believes. On verse 5 he writes as follows (p. 124):—

“The Lord descends in the pillar of cloud, and stands at the door of the tent. He then summons Miriam and Aaron, and they both step forward, viz., from the position which they had taken up together with Moses. Certainly this gives the verb *וַיֵּצֵא* a sense different from that in which it is used in verse 4, and in itself unusual (yet cp. Zech. v 5). Dillmann explains the verb in both cases of going out from the camp, regarding verse 4 (J) and verse 5 (E) as doublets. But (1) It is not in accordance with E's representation elsewhere that the theophanic cloud should appear, and wait for people to come out from the camp; the persons summoned to or seeking God await His appearance, not He theirs; see Ex. xxxiii 7-11, Num. xi 16 f. 24 f. (2) Verse 4 by its reference to the tent, no less than verse 5 by its reference to the cloud, seems to belong to E.”

Dr. Gray's argument that the persons summoned to, or seeking, God await His appearance appears to us unanswerable,

and his reference to Zechariah v. 5 is apt. This fixes the sense of the verb in verse 5. But if the word has this meaning in verse 5, it follows of necessity that in verse 4 it need not mean anything more than stepping forward from the encampment of Moses and Aaron east of the Tent (Num. iii. 38) to the Tent itself. It is true that in verse 10 the R.V. translates: "And the cloud moved *from over* the Tent," and this might be thought to conflict with P; but Messrs. Carpenter and Gray are both careful to insist that this meaning is here unsuitable, and Dr. Gray renders "from beside the Tent," citing xvi. 26, 27, and other passages. It must be remembered that the language of Numbers xvi. 42 (Heb. xvii. 7) certainly implies that the cloud did not always actually touch the Tent in P. It was always over it, but the height may have varied. This is also in harmony with Leviticus xvi. 2.

We return now to chapter xi. The case here rests on verses 26, 27, and 30, and turns on two points: (1) the phrase "gone out" in verse 26, and (2) the opposition between the Tent and the camp in all three verses. The first point has already been disposed of, the verb used being the same as in xii. 4, 5. With regard to the antithesis of camp and Tent this reappears in P. In Numbers ii. 17 the R.V. has "the tent of meeting shall set forward, with the camp of the Levites in the midst of the camps." Unfortunately, as Dr. Gray (*ad. loc.*) remarks, this does not translate the Hebrew, which means "the tent of meeting, the camp of the Levites." Dr. Gray speaks of the awkwardness of this, and we think it probable that the true text is preserved by the Greek, which has "and the camp," etc. This only means the addition of the single letter ך to the Hebrew, and gives a far superior reading. But even if this be incorrect, the antithesis between the Tent and the camps comes out clearly in the latter part of the verse.

For these reasons we can see no ground for supposing that chapter xi. locates the Tent elsewhere than in the center of the camp. Professor Green's language may be adopted:—

"It is claimed that in the conception of these passages the Tabernacle was located altogether outside of the camp, contrary to ch 11 which places it in the centre of the host. But this is an unwarranted inference from expressions which readily admit a different interpretation, and one in harmony with the uniform representation of all other passages relating to the subject. The camp was a vast hollow square with the Tabernacle in the centre and the tribes arranged about it, leaving of course a respectful distance between the house of God and the tents of men. In approaching the Sanctuary it was necessary to go out from the place occupied by the tents and traverse the open space which intervened between them and the Tabernacle." (*Hebraica*, vol. viii. p. 183.)

Once this is grasped, it is clear why xii. 5 speaks of God's coming down in the cloud, i.e. the cloud which from the erection of the Dwelling onwards normally stood above the Tabernacle in the center of the camp: and the last shred of justification for the theory that the various sources contain divergent representations of the cloud finally disappears.

We have now disposed of some of the most formidable arguments for the higher critical partition: and this discussion will tend to shorten our treatment of many of the later chapters.

THE ANALYSIS OF THE NARRATIVE EXODUS XIII.—NUMBERS XI.

We return to the crossing of the Red Sea.

Mr. Carpenter raises one or two points of textual criticism which do not fall within the scope of these essays. His other notes on Exodus xiv. really put forward nothing that is worthy of discussion. Thus, on verses 10b, 11 ("and the children of Israel cried out unto the LORD, and they said unto Moses"), he writes: "In J the Israelites expostulate with Moses; with 11 cp xvii 3 Num xiv 3 Ex v 15. According to Josh xxiv 7 they cried to the LORD; this prayer, therefore, is assigned to

E." The "therefore" is certainly noticeable as an epitome of higher critical logic, but it would be mere waste of time to discuss such arguments.

Exodus xv. contains the song of Moses. It falls outside the main narrative, and will therefore be passed over here.

Exodus xvi. need not now detain us long. Mr. Carpenter makes two main points: first, that in 6 f. Moses and Aaron announce to the people what is not communicated to Moses till 11 f.; and, secondly, that the song implies the existence of the Dwelling. We have already suggested a transposition which meets the first point, and we have shown the baselessness of the second. Mr. Carpenter further asserts that verses 4 and 11 f. "can hardly be from the same writer." We confess that we fail to see why. He makes a more substantial point when he says that the intention to prove the Israelites in verse 4 fits in with xv. 25b. Certainly chapter xv. has no record of any proof of the Israelites, and it is therefore possible that 25b, 26 have accidentally suffered displacement, and really belong to chapter xvi. In that case they would follow verse 30. And this leads us to speak of one of the quaintest of the higher critical vagaries. It is tolerably obvious that verse 31 (And the children of Israel called the name thereof Manna (Heb. *man*)) is closely connected with verse 15 (they said one to another, What (Heb. *man*) is it), but Mr. Carpenter holds that this portion of verse 15 contains a trace of E, and assigns it to a later priestly editor, while giving its sequel (31) to the main body of P, which of course is earlier than the editor! It may be a question whether verse 31 did not originally stand immediately after "for they wist not what it was" in verse 15. Indeed that alteration of place could easily be accounted for by a very common MS. error, the copyist's eye having possibly slipped from the "and Moses said" in verse

15 to the same phrase in verse 32, and the omitted passage (15b-30) having then been written in first in the margin and subsequently (on recopying) one verse too soon.

In verse 32 the Septuagint actually reads "of manna" where the Hebrew has "of it": and this involves no change in the consonantal text as originally written, for the *matres lectionis* and the distinct forms for the final letters are of course comparatively recent: and this reading would remove any awkwardness resulting from the removal of verse 31 to the earlier position. It is curious that Mr. Carpenter, while remarking (note on 22) that verse 31 "is not the proper sequel of 30," did not also add that it is the proper sequel of 15a.

Passing to Exodus xvii., we are speedily confronted with some delicious higher critical reasoning. Doublets—by which the higher critics mean two similar narratives—are regarded as proving diversity of source. At present the Pentateuch contains two narratives in which Moses draws water from a rock, Exodus xvii. and Numbers xx. The critics hold it impossible that any author should have told two such stories, and therefore proceed to apply their curious methods. The result is startling. In place of one author who writes two such narratives, we double the number and get two (J and E). "J's traditions," writes Mr. Carpenter (vol. ii. p. 107), "attached parallel incidents to two names, Massah and Meribah. E appears also to have contained explanations of both designations." In addition, P had a Meribah story.¹ So that we reach the result that when the higher critics desire to divide two by two, their arithmetical labors lead them to believe that the quotient is five!² Truly a wondrous cure for the Pentateuchal doublets!

¹ Perhaps, also a Rephidim story (Num. xxxiii. 14) unless this be based by P's on the combined Pentateuch.

² Or perhaps six, if P had a Rephidim story.

It seems unnecessary to follow the details of the reasoning by which the perfectly straightforward narrative of verses 1-7 is reduced to a chaotic collection of unintelligible fragments. All the difficulties that the higher critics experience here are of their own making, and find no support in the undivided text. Mr. Carpenter, however, takes "Horeb," in verse 6, as proving that "the story has been placed too soon . . . for Israel has not yet reached the sacred mountain." But this is due to a misunderstanding. Verses 5 and 6 represent Israel as not yet having reached Horeb. On the contrary, Moses is to pass on to Horeb before the people, and God will stand before him there (*not* here). No doubt the water would issue from the rock at Horeb into a channel which would bring it to the people at Rephidim.

Mr. Carpenter holds the fight with Amalek in verses 8-16 to be misplaced. "Joshua enters in 9 without introduction as though he were well known: he is already the tried captain on whom devolves the choice of men for military enterprise. Yet in xxxiii 11 he is formally described, apparently for the first time, and he is then still 'a young man.'" (Vol. ii. p. 107.) "Tried captain" is an imaginative touch, and in the critical scheme the same source that describes him "apparently for the first time" in xxxiii. is permitted to refer to him for a couple of ante-first times in xxiv. 13; xxxii. 17. It is not obvious why Mr. Carpenter should be surprised at a young man's being still a young man after the lapse of a few weeks. If he is astonished at a young man's being intrusted with a large command, he need only think of the ages of the great captains of the world, Alexander, Hannibal, Napoleon, etc. Nor is it clear why Moses—who was eighty when the Exodus took place—should be spoken of as "no longer able himself to sustain his hand outstretched with the rod." Let Mr. Carpenter experiment

with a rod, and see whether he finds it easy himself to sustain his hand outstretched with a rod for a number of hours. To speak of the location of Amalek elsewhere near Kadesh as an obstacle is to ignore the whole drift of the narrative. "Then [Heb. and] *came* Amalek," i.e. unnecessarily and gratuitously, to attack the Israelites: and the reference in Deuteronomy xxv. 17 f. certainly appears to confirm the early dating of this episode. There is, therefore, no ground for holding that "the identification of the incident with Rephidim (8) is editorial."

Exodus xviii. calls for no further comment. We have already recognized that it is not in place at present. Mr. Carpenter thinks that "J"'s narrative may have stood before Numbers x. 29 originally, and we think this would be a very suitable place for the whole chapter.

On the other hand, Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 appears to be out of place in its present position. (1) It clearly has no connection with the narrative which at present surrounds it. (2) Exodus xxiv. 14, providing for the interim transaction of judicial business by Aaron and Hur during the absence of Moses and Joshua, appears to refer to some such arrangement as that here described being already in full swing. (3) It would be very suitable to the introduction of Joshua, in which case it must precede Exodus xvii. If it be placed after Exodus xiii. 22, it will be found that all difficulties disappear, and the constant practice of Moses in going outside the camp and speaking to the cloud attaches naturally to the description of the cloud in the preceding verse. Let the notices relating to (a) Joshua, (b) the seat of judgment, (c) the cloud, (d) the judges, (e) the Tent of Meeting (including Ex. xxv. 22), be read continuously as suggested, with Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 after xiii. 22 and Exodus xviii. before Numbers x. 29, and it will be seen that the narrative gains in intelligibility.

Chapter xix. is cut up in the usual fashion, but no discrepancies are alleged, save one, which depends on the state of the text. Verse 25 ends abruptly with the words "said unto them," leaving in doubt what Moses did say. Obviously something has here fallen out, and no doubt the missing passage contained the sequel to verse 24 (Moses and Aaron to come up) as well as the speech to the people. The "coming up" cannot have been to the summit, for xx. 19 excludes this: but presumably Moses and Aaron came within the barrier. The rest of the analysis of the chapter is effected by the usual methods. At this stage it is unnecessary to weary our readers with any detailed examination of them.

Nothing of moment is urged against chapter xxiv., and we come to xxxii., where the narrative is resumed.

The first point of importance is raised on verses 25-29. Mr. Carpenter thinks that in 29 "the tribe of Levi is apparently consecrated as the sacred tribe . . . this is altogether different from the programme of P in xxviii." (Vol. ii. p. 131, note on Ex. xxxiii. 25a.) His inference as to the meaning of 29 is, we think, erroneous. It is not suggested in the text that the priesthood was conferred on the tribe as the result of its zeal. If this were the meaning, a ready parallel could be found in Numbers xxv. 10-13 (P); but the difficulty really only arises from a misreading of the passage. The rest of Mr. Carpenter's note clearly betrays the perplexity in which his critical principles have here involved him. But he makes one further remark which should be noted. He thinks that verse 35 refers to some further punishment of the people. It appears to us that verses 30-34 are out of place, and that verse 35 should follow verse 29. Thus it does not seem to us to refer to any new punishment.

We have already suggested that xxxiii. 7-11 should be re-

moved to an earlier position in the narrative. We would point out that xxxiii. 30-34 would follow xxxiii. 6 quite suitably, "bring up this people," in verse 12a, following conveniently on xxxii. 34, but the rest of the chapter contains difficulties that are still unsolved, and indeed appear to indicate textual corruption. Mr. Carpenter writes as follows:—

"The expostulation of Moses in this passage seems directly connected with the command in 1-3. But it may be doubted whether the materials of 12-23 are now arranged in their proper order. The words quoted in 12 'Yet thou hast said' etc. are not uttered till 17: either, therefore, 17 once stood before 12, or, if 17 is in its place, some other divine utterance must have preceded 12. The latter is the view of Bacon who unites 3 with 12 by means of Num xi 10b-15 and a conjectural passage containing the required phrase (it must be remembered that before the union of JE with P Ex xxxiii-xxxiv 28 was followed immediately by Num x 29-xii). Another suggestion is that of Kautzsch who proposes to translate 14 as a question, 'Shall (or must) my presence go with thee, and must I give thee rest?' while Dillmann regards 14-16 as the sequel of xxxiv 6-9, a suggestion which has the support of Driver. The difficulty may be partially met by a simple re-arrangement of the verses; if 17 be transferred as the antecedent of 12, the prayer of Moses 13 'Make me to *know* thy way' is answered by the promise 'My presence shall go with thee.' Of this (16) Moses desires immediate assurance which the LORD grants with the announcement (19) that he will make his goodness pass before him. But Moses, still urgent, prays that the LORD will enable him to *see* his glory, his very self (18). The prayer cannot be satisfied (20), 'Thou canst not *see* my face' (the 'presence' of 15): but in the cleft of the rock he shall behold his back as the LORD passes by 21-23. The more natural order would seem to be 17, 12-16, 19, 18, 20-23 leading directly to xxxiv 6-9." (Vol. ii. p. 133, on 12a.)

But Mr. Carpenter's proposed order is also open to objection, for 17 says, "I will do this thing *also that thou hast spoken*" and must therefore be preceded by some intercession of Moses which is wanting in the scheme suggested. Moreover, verse 15 f. should apparently come before verse 14. On the whole, it seems best to suppose that the phrases in verse 12 do not refer to anything in our present Pentateuch, but em-

body an appeal which either has some hidden meaning, or else refers to something of which we have no record.

We conclude this essay by considering the points raised on Numbers xi. 4-34.

We take first the question of the doublets. We have seen that when the higher critics wish to deny the unity of the narrative they rely on duplicate narratives—a feature which they profess to be able to remove. Then they perform their arithmetical operations, and triumphantly produce a larger number of duplicates as the solution of the problem. We witnessed the process in the case of Massah and Meribah, and it may be seen again in the case of the manna. Numbers xi. 4-6 clearly implies that the Israelites had been on the manna diet for a long time and were heartily tired of it. Accordingly it becomes necessary to postulate an earlier reference to manna in JE to make up for the loss of Exodus xvi., most of which has gone to P. If with Mr. Carpenter Exodus xvi. 4 be given to E while the present passage is assigned to J, we shall have at least four manna stories, viz. J two (Num. xi. and its antecedent in the same document) ; E one (Ex. xvi. 4 and its original context) ; P one (Ex. xvi., except verse 4). Moreover, E and P inserted their manna stories at precisely the same point in the narrative, and J's first manna story, being long before Kibroth-hattaavah, must also have come soon after the Exodus. Such are the results of "Critical" analysis!

With regard to the quails the matter is different. It is true that once before the people had had quails, but in Exodus xvi. they play a very subsidiary part, whereas, on this occasion, the flight lasted a whole month. The dates raise some presumption that there really were two flights of quails. The Exodus occurred in the early spring, and the first flight of quails took place on or about the fifteenth day of the second month. They

left Sinai on the twentieth day of the corresponding month of the next year. If, as many think, their year at this time was a lunar year, the solar anniversary of the fifteenth day would fall on the twenty-fifth day of the second month. After the departure on the twentieth day they set forward three days' journey. The season of the year was, therefore, as nearly as possible the same as that of the first flight of quails. The difference in the duration of the two flights may perhaps be due to the altered position of the Israelites or to some temporary circumstances that were peculiar to one or other of the particular years: certainly it explains the surprise of Moses in verses 21 f. If the desert of the wanderings lay near the ordinary route of the quails in their annual northward flight, nothing is more probable than that the Israelites did in fact benefit annually, though after the first two years the incident may not have called for special notice. The annual recurrence of a phenomenon that is well known to happen every year cannot reasonably be regarded as a ground for denying the same authorship to the accounts relating to different years.

From what the critics will not believe we pass to what they will. Mr. Carpenter's note on 10b runs as follows:—

"The expostulation of Moses 10b-12, 15 does not seem in harmony with the cause implied in the context. His 'displeasure' is plainly directed, not like the anger of the Lord against the people, but against the Lord himself. The language of 12 suggests that he repudiates a responsibility which really lies upon the God of Israel. But that responsibility has not here been thrown upon him, except by remote implication. On the other hand it is formally laid on him in Ex xxxiii 1, 12. Now in the original document of JE the Horeb section Ex xxxii-xxxiv immediately preceded the departure in Num x 29 ff, and stood consequently in near proximity to the manna scene. Bacon accordingly conjectures that this passage once stood after Ex xxxiii 3 and before xxxiii 12. In the combination of J and E these verses were displaced by the insertion of the account of the Tent of Meeting, and were woven into the nearest appropriate situation, where (on this view) they have dislocated the connexion of 13 with 4-10a."

In plain English this means that an imbecile (called a redactor) found certain narratives, chopped them up into sections of unequal length, and subsequently put them together in a different order without regard to their sense. "The insertion of the account of the Tent of Meeting" in a place where it produces endless confusion and the "weaving" of these verses into their present position are among the results of this remarkable procedure. On the whole the theory affords striking illustration of the boundless credulity of the higher critics.

The fact is that these writers have not the slightest understanding of human nature. Consequently they will believe anything except that there is a deal of human nature in man; and it is to be feared that for this reason this chapter must always remain unintelligible to them. But this does not exempt us from the duty of explaining it.

Attention must be given to two points, the feelings of the people and the feelings of Moses. The Israelites had been supported mainly on manna for more than a year. Of course there had been the first flight of quails, and no doubt there were occasional slaughterings of animals belonging to their flocks and herds, but the staple and continuous diet had been manna. That it had grown monotonous and nauseating was an inevitable result, and so far the complaint of the people was entirely reasonable and was probably viewed by Moses with some sympathy. But as frequently happens, a reasonable grievance led to conduct that may more easily be understood than justified. The people used language that savored of doubt of the Divine power and more than savored of ingratitude and infidelity. As a natural result their complaints produced in their leader a feeling of despondency from which no man could have been exempt in similar circumstances. In his

discouragement he felt the task that had been set him too much for his strength and he took the profoundly human course of blaming Him who had laid the burden upon him.

Again in human affairs the proximate or immediate cause of any action frequently differs from and conceals a motive which, though really efficient, appears more remote. It is the last straw that breaks the camel's back. This principle finds illustration in the complaint "I am not able to bear all this people alone, because it is too heavy for me." It would probably be wrong to regard these words as the expression of a feeling experienced for the first time on this occasion. Rather should we see in them the final utterance of a sentiment which had grown in strength with each successive incident. "Ye have been rebellious against the LORD from the day that I knew you" (Deut. ix. 24). And the rebelliousness would be felt the more keenly at each successive episode—especially after the great events at Sinai. Hence the complaint and prayer of verses 14 and 15. Hence, too, the appointment of the seventy elders in verses 16 f., 24–30, in direct reply (verse 17 *ad fin.*) to the prayer of 14 f.

It would be impossible to frame a narrative which would be truer to human nature—and therefore less in accordance with the standards of the higher critics—than that contained in these verses.

It need scarcely be said that the critics wrench 16 f., 24b–30, from the context, claiming that a fatuous redactor, finding two utterly unrelated stories, tore them in shreds and then made a chess-board pattern out of the fragments. Mr. Carpenter, on the ground of the alleged position of the Tent of Meeting, the appearance of Joshua and the "prophetic conceptions," wishes to give these verses to E; but, as Exodus xviii. has already been assigned to that source, he is in a difficulty. Therefore to

quote his own expression: "By the side of the secular judges over the 'small matters,' the coadjutor-prophets must be assigned to E^s." It is a pity that Mr. Carpenter did not succeed in carrying his discrimination between a judge and a prophet a little further, and recognize that the relief here sought by Moses has little or nothing to do with the transaction of judicial business. An excellent example of the activity of these elders is to be found in Numbers xvi. 25. It cannot reasonably be claimed that there is anything judicial about the action there attributed to them. They support Moses in a rebellion against his authority. In saying this we do not mean to suggest that these seventy elders did not assist in hearing difficult matters (not easy cases like the captains of thousands, etc.) and transacting public business. But the narrative leaves no doubt that the primary object of their appointment was to give Moses much-needed human support in maintaining his influence and authority over a people who were unfortunately prone to rebellion, and that this object was achieved by conferring on the elders a portion of the Divine spirit, and so rendering them effective and whole-hearted exponents and supporters of the aims and policy of their leader. The relief given was chiefly by means of their sympathy, their coöperation, their family influence, and their general effect on public opinion, and only in a very minor degree by their assistance in the judicial determination of cases.

ARTICLE IX.

NOTES.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITHFULNESS: THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF
JESUS AND PAUL.

ONE of the oldest conflicts known to religion is that between faith and works. On the one side is the theoretical and on the other the practical, on the one the external and on the other the internal, overt act and inner intent being pitted against each other.

Zoroastrianism is a religion of good morals, and yet as a system it abounds in superstitious rites and observances to disbelieve in which means certain death. Brahmanism, on the contrary, is a religion of speculative theories, yet its scriptures abound in texts making all hinge upon the deeds of righteousness performed. In the Christian Scriptures the same conflict goes on. Amaziah's priest makes all the favors or disfavor of Jahweh, the national God, circle around the correct performance of a ceremony, and Amos, the prophet, combats him with a theology in which the common moralities are paramount. Isaiah protested against a religion of faith which was without works, Paul as earnestly assailed a religion of works which was without faith. It was this same Paul who said: "A man is not justified by the works of the law, but only through faith in Jesus Christ"; and over against him in the New Testament is the common sense Jewish Christian, James, asserting that "by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

Is there any way out of the difficulty which shall be at once both sensible and biblical? Certain it is that there is nothing under heaven a mere belief in which will save a man, if by salvation we mean anything that is at all worth while, and James does well to say so in the very faces of the Martin

Luthers who persist in calling his book "an epistle of straw." On the other hand, it is equally as certain that there is no list of duties a mere mechanical performance of which will bestow salvation,—the salvation which is force of character, and magnetism of person,—and Paul deserves praise for telling us this, all his modern detractors to the contrary notwithstanding.

Personally, I believe the problem is soluble; with Browning,—

"I have tried each way singly; now for both."

There is an English word ready at hand that bridges the chasm, and, above all, gives good sense. Furthermore, by substituting it in the texts where it rightfully belongs, it presents an excellent composite picture of the biblical teaching as a whole concerning salvation.

Dogmatic theologians have often lamented the absence from the chapters of the Old Testament of the doctrine of salvation by faith. It is the purpose of this Note to show that the doctrine, as usually apprehended, is present in the New Testament only by virtue of mistranslations and misunderstandings. The story is long and somewhat involved, but its main outline is worth the telling. It amounts simply to this, that our New Testaments are not Greek, as we have so long boasted, but Hebrew (or Aramaic) with Greek words; and, if we would understand them at all correctly, we must translate them back into Hebrew, and this Hebrew again into English. To illustrate: "How do you find yourself?" is not English. The words, to be sure, are; but the idiom, or way of putting it, is not. The greeting is German with English words. "How do you carry yourself?" is the corresponding French, and "How do you do?" the equivalent English. A German professor once said of an enemy, "If I was not peaceful, like a lamb, I killed him already before a long time." He was thinking in German, and giving the corresponding English words as he went along. To find the meaning of "already" in the professor's sentence, we must go to the German dictionary rather than to the one lying upon our own desk. So, if we would ascertain the meaning of the New Testament doctrine of Justifi-

cation by Faith, we should search the Hebrew rather than the Greek lexicon.

The evidence for this latter statement is overwhelming. A few examples only will be given.

In Hebrew a single word is used to express the ideas of both "word" and "thing." The New Testament follows suit, giving to the Greek word *rema* a meaning which it never has in the Greek writers (Luke ii. 15).

The Hebrew word "heart" is always used also of mind, and as a consequence the Greek word "heart" is in the New Testament repeatedly used of mind. The Revisers of the Old Testament were aware of this, and frequently substituted "mind" for "heart" in their revision. The New Testament translators should have done the same. In Luke x. 27 the phrases "with all thy heart" and "with all thy mind" are a double translation of the "with all thy heart" of the Deuteronomy original.

The same Hebrew word means both "righteousness" and "alms." The King James Version of Matt. vi. 1, correctly assuming that Jesus meant "alms," adopted the Greek word that said so; the Revisers, with equal assurance, assuming that here, as in so many other cases, we have a Greek word in a Hebrew sense, restored the Greek word which means "righteousness." Now, though this word never means "alms" in classic Greek writers, it does mean "alms" here, and should have been so translated.

The Hebrew word "bowels" is the common word throughout the Old Testament for compassion, pity, and is so translated in all cases where it occurs. The Greek word "bowels" is less often used figuratively; and, when it is so used, the passions are prevailingly those of anger (!) and enmity (!). Yet in the New Testament the Greek word has the Hebrew meaning assigned to it without a word of explanation (see, however, Phil. ii. 1), and our translators retain the word "bowels" in English, and add an explanatory phrase (1 John iii. 17). "To shut up the bowels" is not Greek any more than it is English: it is Hebrew, meaning "to withhold pity."

The Greeks said, "bear fruit," as we do: the Hebrew and the New Testament say, "make fruit" (Luke iii. 8). The Greeks said, "behold me": the Hebrew and the New Testament say, "behold I" (Acts ix. 11). The Greek salutation is "grace": the Hebrew is "peace." Paul uses both, though the latter meant nothing to native Greek hearers.

The preposition "in" is used in various ways in the New Testament that would baffle a Greek scholar. In scores of places it means "with," as, for example, in the baptismal formula; or "by," as in the phrase "we are saved by hope." The Hebrews had few adjectives, and circumlocutions are common (Luke xvi. 9; 1 Pet. ii. 9). They did not compare their adjectives, and therefore the New Testament does not know how to manage the comparatives and superlatives. Comparisons were made, not by the help of "than," as in English and Greek, but by the use of the preposition "from"; and this idiom forces the Greek *para* into the most outlandish situations (Heb. xii. 24; Rom. i. 25). The relative in Hebrew merely expresses the relative idea, but has no pronominal force in oblique cases, and hence the proper pronoun must be used along with the relative where there would be any ambiguity. The sentence "This is the man who I saw him" is good Hebrew for "This is the man whom I saw." This peculiarity of Hebrew speech forces its way into the New Testament repeatedly.

The Jew said, "Not every lie is of the truth," when he meant, "No lie is" (1 John ii. 21). This is not Greek.

Now the significance of this whole string of facts for our argument is this, that the Hebrew word "believe" means both "to have faith in" and "to be faithful to," and the Hebrew word "faith" means more often "faithfulness"; and, the New Testament being so often Hebrew with Greek words, may we not conclude that such is the case in its use of faith? It is certainly an ominous fact that the word "faithfulness" occurs so often in our English Old Testament and so seldom in our New. This in itself strongly argues that something is wrong somewhere. Shall we change "faithfulness" to

"faith," and so introduce the doctrines of Paul into the Psalms of David; or shall we translate our Paul as we do our David, and thus find the doctrine of Salvation by Faithfulness in both Testaments? But one answer is possible. The word "faithfulness" has dropped out of our New Testaments through a failure on the part of scholars to recognize that our New Testaments are essentially Jewish. Professor Delitzsch has turned the New Testament into Hebrew for the purpose of converting Jews. Let us turn to some familiar passages and note how he renders them. Galatians iii. 11 reads exactly as in Hab. ii. 4: "The just shall live by his faithfulness." Romans v. 1, 2, has added charm when rendered, "Therefore, being justified by faithfulness, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access by faithfulness unto this grace wherein we stand." One after another the familiar texts rush to our minds; and have they lost aught in sense or suggestiveness or spiritual power? "By grace are ye saved through faithfulness"; "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation unto every one that is faithful"; "Be faithful to the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thine house"; "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever is faithful to him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

The American Revised Version lends aid to my argument by changing "faith" to "faithfulness" in a half-dozen important passages. They certainly should have added Matthew xxiii. 23, where *krisis* is the Hebrew *mishpat*, "justice," and *eleos* is *chesed*, loving-kindness, and *pistis* is *emunah*, "faithfulness."

With one more quotation I close, and I give this in the words of our English versions: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life" (Rev. ii. 10).

Speer, Illinois.

A. B. CURTIS.

GROUND OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.

AMONG the most prominent representatives of the New England theology is Dr. George Nye Boardman, late Professor in

Chicago Theological Seminary. While he has no formal statement of his system of theology, he has issued a pamphlet, privately printed for his friends, in which a pretty fair summary of his system is given. We are permitted to publish the following sections from it relating to the authority of the Scriptures. They are certainly very timely :—

“The ultimate authority in religious doctrine is a question of the highest importance. The preacher must have something to rest upon with perfect assurance as he proclaims a scheme of salvation. Much of his power will depend on his impressing his hearers with the fact that he himself believes what he says. He must be able to argue the positions which he assumes with such cogency that his hearers will be compelled to admit their truthfulness, at least their strong probability. It would be worse than useless to appeal to myths or bare traditions. That which is merely possible, that which requires apology or modification, does not compel assent, does not enforce conviction. Religious teaching must have a more special adaptation than mere congeniality to the inquiring spirit, it must carry conviction to the cold, severe intellect, for our gospel has the mission of calling not the righteous but sinners to repentance.

“The clearest and most direct argument for Christianity, as it seems to me, is the ordinary argument adopted by our Congregational Churches and by Protestants generally, the argument stated with inimitable clearness and cogency by Dr. Paley. Christ stands before the world a teacher sent from God. His mission is attested by miracles, works that must be attributed to the First Great Creative Cause. The messenger from heaven sanctioned as the divinely appointed teacher must be accepted as speaking with a divine commission; and his followers, so far as they repeat his words, can base their faith, and call upon their hearers to base their faith, upon a *Thus saith the Lord*. This has been adopted by traditional orthodoxy among the Reformed Churches as the unquestioned ground of confidence in the gospel. And since the sacred Scriptures are received as the word of God, it has been considered proper to require of those professing the Christian faith to aver that they receive the Old and New Testaments as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice. These views I accepted and taught. They seemed to me to embrace the facts known to us concerning the rise of Christianity, God's revelations, and man's response to them.

“But I allowed myself some latitude of opinion and of Scripture interpretation. I could not believe in a strictly verbal inspiration. I believed that the canon of Scripture had not been authoritatively settled. I doubted the inspiration of *Esther* and the *Song of Solo-*

mon. I thought many narratives and imprecations, if inspired, had no authority as precepts but were offset as guides to conduct by contrary teachings. Inspiration does not imply approval.

"I was well aware of the difficulties that beset my view of the evidences of Christianity.

"No one can pass lightly over Hume's assertion that a miracle cannot be proved to have occurred, whether it has occurred or not.

"Supernatural interpositions seem of themselves improbable. Some of the miracles narrated in the Bible seem, in their nature, incredible. To say nothing of those reported in the Old Testament, the feeding of the multitude and transforming the water into wine, are of a character to raise questionings. It is a kind of damper upon the acceptance of miraculous evidence that Dante should place the wonders connected with the founding of Rome by the side of those occurring at the introduction of Christianity, and infer from them the divine affection for that city and the approval of monarchy as the best form of government. It is to be noted also that Christianity is not the only religion that claims the sanction of miracles.

"My lectures were given before the higher criticism had attained its present influence, but it could not then be set aside as undeserving of notice.

"Notwithstanding the force of these objections, it seems to me we must adhere to a religion based upon a supernatural revelation,—supernatural not to be confounded with natural.

"The attempts to base Christian certitude on other foundations than a certified revelation have not seemed to me satisfactory. Evolving a scheme of religion from the consciousness of Christ appears to me both accepting and rejecting revelation, and then making vague surmisings the foundation of a system. Personal convictions may satisfy an individual but cannot be enforced upon the world at large. Christian experiences are strong confirmations of our religion, and may be justly made the ground of appeal to the worldly mind, but they must be preceded by principles to be embraced by the intellect."

THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST AS A RANSOM PAID TO THE DEVIL.

As there is frequent reference in popular discussion to the idea that the doctrine of the early church was that the sacrifice of Christ was a ransom paid to the devil, it may be well to quote the authority of Macpherson's "Christian Dogmatics,"¹ a recent very thorough theological work for the following statement. He points out that in fact there is no developed

¹ Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. \$3.00, *net*.

theory of the Atonement in the writing of the Fathers. They were content with the fact, which was generally stated in scriptural phraseology; but in no case do they work out elementary hints as to the direction in which a theory is to be sought, in the form of any complete theory of the idea and purpose of the death of Christ. That is not to be found until the time of Anselm and the Scholastics. His statement is as follows:—

“It is very commonly maintained that the notion of a redemption paid to the devil, which finds expression under a variety of forms in the patristic writings, is such a theory, and that the fathers who make use of that conception meant to propose it as a regularly elaborated exposition of the work of Christ in man's redemption. A careful study of the works of Irenæus, Origen, Augustine, and even Gregory of Nyssa, will show that the idea of ransoming the sinner from the power of the devil is with them nothing more than a concrete way of representing the truth that Christ's death must be considered as having a real power in eliminating evil from the nature and life of man, and overthrowing its dominion. This, however, is merely a restatement of the fact of the atonement in reference to one of its important aspects. The concrete representation of this fact led to the adoption of a certain unfortunate phraseology, which, however, ought to be regarded as simply an exaggerated use of the personification of sin, which within legitimate limits has been employed by Paul himself. The statement, which has given just cause of offence, made most distinctly by Gregory of Nyssa, that the devil was deceived into accepting Christ in the place of the sinful race of men, is simply an odd conceit by which it was supposed that certain aspects of the Saviour's work could be illustrated. There was evidently no intention on the part of those early Christian writers to go beyond a restatement of the New Testament exhibition of the work of Christ, and no thought of formulating a theory on the basis of these Scripture facts. It is only with the opening of the scholastic age that we meet with any attempt to frame a theory as to the meaning and the essential idea of the atonement. The history of the theories of the atonement properly begins with Anselm.”

New York City.

HENRY A. STIMSON.

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

JERUSALEM: The Topography, Economics, and History, from the Earliest Times to A.D. 70. By GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Old Testament Language, Literature, and Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow; author of "The Historical Geography of the Holy Land," etc. With Thirteen Colored Maps and many Illustrations in Collotype. 8vo. Pp. xx, 498; xvi, 631. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1908. \$7.50, *net*.

In these monumental volumes we have brought together everything that can be desired concerning the city of Jerusalem, both past and present. The author's familiarity with the land of Palestine, as illustrated in his "Historical Geography of the Holy Land," together with his numerous visits to Jerusalem and his attention to all the minute details bearing upon the subject, makes this work one which cannot for a long time have a rival. The maps are so carefully drawn, and the photographic illustrations are so lifelike, that with this book in his possession one scarcely needs to visit the place in person.

The first volume is devoted to the material aspects of the city, and the second to its history. The chapters upon the "Topography" and those upon the "Economics and Politics" are especially noteworthy. The relation of the geology of the region to the natural resources, to its water-supply and its defenses, is clearly brought out. Upon the most disputed points of local topography, Dr. Smith occupies a cautious, conservative position. He is not convinced by the arguments of Gordon, Dawson, Conder, Merrill, and others endeavoring to show that at the time of the crucifixion the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher was inside of the walls. Indeed, it would seem that the author has hardly given deserved weight to their facts and arguments. After a very inadequate presen-

tation of the subject, he simply closes the discussion by saying that "on our present data it is hopeless to attempt to decide between the rival and contradictory arguments; and my own conclusion after a study of the remains, so far as they are still visible, and of the literature on the subject, is that we do not know how the Second Wall ran from the First to the Tyropœon; we do not know whether it ran inside or outside the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre" (vol. i. p. 249).

From the chapter upon Natural Resources, we learn that the agricultural resources of the country are not in themselves sufficient to account for Jerusalem. The ground in which cereal crops can be grown is extremely limited. But the olive, the vine, and the fig find in this vicinity their natural home, and in the former times furnished, in addition to sustenance for a large population, a considerable surplus for export through the channels for commerce. The cultivation of the olive implies, also, a pretty high state of civilization, for the young plant has to be carefully cultivated for fifteen or twenty years before reaching its full value, thus requiring an amount of foresight which constitutes the principal element of high civilization. But after the tree has once become firmly rooted it will continue to bear fruit for centuries.

In the chapter upon "Commerce and Imports" it is contended that the surplus of oil for export was very great in all but the most disastrous periods of Jerusalem's history, and that it was sufficient at least to pay for the wheat and salt which they required to import. But the main support of the city came from the revenues of the royal house and those of the temple and priesthood. Others have pointed out, however, that the Dead Sea and the valley of the Jordan drew traders to that region from the valley of the Euphrates at a very early period. Asphalt was a necessity in the construction of buildings in Babylonia, and its existence in large quantities about the Dead Sea was probably one of the reasons that made Chedorlaomer so anxious to keep hold of the territory. The salt also of the Dead Sea entered largely into the channels of foreign commerce, as well as furnished a supply for local needs. But,

while these two subjects are apparently neglected by the author, his discussion of the royal revenues, of the trades, crafts, and industries, is especially full and illuminating, as is the chapter on "The Multitude," in which the influence of the common people is graphically depicted.

The second volume, treating of the history, is more evidently a compilation than is the first, and is to some extent vitiated by the author's destructive critical views. The author is certainly wrong in maintaining, as he does (p. 19), that "the pre-Israelite masters of Jerusalem were, like Israel themselves, Semitic"; for, as Sayce has shown, the name of Kheba, which is a component of the name of the king of Jerusalem in the age of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, is a Hittite name found on more than one cuneiform tablet. In this case, therefore, as in many others, Dr. Smith gives more weight to his critical presuppositions than to the facts in the case. The author also displays his critical predilection in categorically assigning the book of Deuteronomy to as late a date as 621 B.C. With such critical presuppositions the author cannot well avoid reading into his volumes between the lines of fact much of hypothesis which will have to be taken with a large degree of allowance.

LIGHT FROM EGYPTIAN PAPYRI, on Jewish History before Christ. By the Rev. CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., Trin. Coll., Dub.; M.A., Exeter Coll., Oxon; Ph.D. of the University of Leipzig; Donnellan Lecturer in the University of Dublin (1880-1); Bampton Lecturer (1878); Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint (1893-7) in the University of Oxford; Knight of the Order of the North Star of Sweden. 12mo. Pp. xvii, 123. London: Williams and Norgate.

Indirectly this volume is a defense of the author's work upon "Daniel and his Prophecies." In that volume he has ably defended the genuineness of the book of Daniel, and presented an interpretation making the prophecies refer to the events subsequent to the Christian era. The discovery of some remarkable papyri in Egypt serves to sustain both of the author's positions. These discoveries were of various Aramaic documents in Upper Egypt pertaining to the history of a Jewish

colony which had settled in the island of Elephantinê, near the lower cataract of the Nile, before the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses in 525 B.C. (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1908, p. 170). The most important of these documents were written about the time of Nehemiah's second visit to Jerusalem, in 432 B.C.

The importance of these discoveries with reference to the date of the book of Daniel lies in the testimony which they bear to the use of the Aramaic language at that early date, for it had been contended that this language, in which a portion of Daniel is written, was not in use by the Jews at that time. But it now appears that the Aramaic passages found in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel are, to all intents and purposes, identical in language with that of the documents written by a Jewish colony in Upper Egypt from 471 B.C. to 411 B.C. With these facts there collapses a whole series of false inferences by the higher critics concerning the genuineness of the Aramaic passages in the Bible.

In the fourth chapter Dr. Wright adduces a strong argument both for his interpretation of the book of Daniel and for his adhesion to the traditional date, by enumerating a large number of striking events occurring during the Maccabean period which are not noticed in the book of Daniel. He justly maintains that it would have been impossible for the book to have been written in the Maccabean age without reference to these events, and that, as prophetic references, the statements of Daniel are not sufficiently definite to limit their interpretation to that period.

A HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT EGYPTIANS. (The Historical Series for Bible Students.) By JAMES HENRY BREASTED, Ph.D., Professor of Egyptology and Oriental History in the University of Chicago; Corresponding Member of the Royal Academy of Sciences of Berlin. With Four Maps and Three Plans. 12mo. Pp. xiii, 469. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908. \$1.25, *net*.

This work is not a condensation of the author's larger work upon "The Ancient Records of Egypt," but is a new one,

written later, with all the advantages of the author's extensive knowledge of the subject. Both for its literary style and for its comprehensive treatment of the subject, it stands unrivaled among the popular histories of the ancient Egyptians. It is interesting to notice that, while the author would bring the date of the First Pyramid down to about 3000 B.C. (which he says is coming to be the generally accepted date), he adduces positive evidence that in Lower Egypt astronomical knowledge of high character had so long preceded this that the year of 365 days was determined upon and introduced as early as 4241 B.C., which he declares to be "the earliest fixed date in the history of the world as known to us" (p. 15).

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE, embracing Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology, and Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Biography from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. Based on the Third Edition of the *Realencyklopädie*, founded by J. J. Herzog, and Edited by Albert Hauck. Prepared by more than Six Hundred Scholars and Specialists, under the Supervision of SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D. (Editor-in-Chief), with the Assistance of Charles Colebrook Sherman and George William Gilmore, M.A. (Associate Editors), and the following Department Editors: Clarence Augustine Beckwith, D.D. (Department of Systematic Theology), Henry King Carroll, LL.D. (Department of Minor Denominations), John Thomas Creagh, D.D. (Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders) (Vol. I.) and James Francis Driscoll, D.D. (Vols. II.-XII.), James Frederick McCurdy, Ph.D., LL.D. (Department of the Old Testament), Henry Sylvester Nash, D.D. (Department of the New Testament), Albert Henry Newman, D.D., LL.D., (Department of Church History), Frank Horace Vizetelly, F.S.A. (Department of Pronunciation and Typography). Complete in Twelve Volumes. Volume I. AACHEN-BASILIAN. 8vo. Pp. xxix, 500. New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Company. 1908. Complete, \$60; per volume, \$5.

The range of topics treated in the old Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia was such that it met a very widely felt want, giving it a large circulation. It is well that, after a quarter of a cen-

ture, a new and an enlarged edition should be presented to the public. This is now being accomplished under the editorship of Dr. Jackson, whose close relations with Dr. Schaff and whose wide range of personal attainments eminently fit him for the undertaking. The editorial names associated with him in the announcement will add greatly to the expectations which are raised in advance of its publication. The present volume has 500 double-column pages, a size more manageable than that of the more bulky volumes of the preceding edition. So great are the changes in the present edition that it is practically a new work, giving in substantial entirety the articles in the third edition of the *Realencyklopädie*, with the further advantage of editorship in nearly every case by the original authors. The additional matter furnished by the American editors greatly increases its value. Nowhere else will the reader find so wide a range of religious topics treated in, on the whole, so satisfactory a manner.

The first edition of the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia was edited with the effect, if not with the design, of counteracting the extreme liberal tendencies of numerous articles in the German original. The present edition, on the other hand, seems to be designed to counteract the conservatism of many of the German writers. In their anxiety to do so, they have fallen into many serious and unfortunate blunders; so that the first volume is scarcely out before it needs to be revised. With the unseemly confidence characteristic of the destructive critical school, to which some of the editors belong, we find the Encyclopedia committed to the indorsement of many misstatements of fact. For example, in the original, the article upon "Abraham," by Professor Köhler, is a well-considered defense of the patriarch's personality and of the general historicity of the patriarchs. In endeavoring to controvert Dr. Köhler's position, the Editor insists upon the chronological difficulty of synchronizing Abraham with Hammurabi, whose date he categorically places in the twenty-third century B.C., and the same statement is made in a similar manner in the article upon "Babylonia." But, as illustrating the hazardous nature of conjectural criti-

cism, since these articles were written, Dr. King, of London, has discovered indubitable evidence that the second dynasty of that period in Babylonia was contemporaneous with portions of the first and third; so that 368 years are to be deducted from the supposed date of Hammurabi, giving him the date 1974-1820 B.C., which synchronizes perfectly with that of Abraham.

HISTORICAL AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES IN LITERATURE RELATED TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. Issued under the Direction of the Department of Biblical and Patristic Greek. Second Series: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies. Volume I. Part VII. **THE IRENAEUS TESTIMONY TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL: Its Extent, Meaning, and Value.** By FRANK GRANT LEWIS, Ph.D. 8vo. Pp. 64. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1908. 54 cents, postpaid.

One of the results of this able discussion is to "give good evidence for believing that the celebrated John of Asia was the son of Zebedee and that he was responsible for Johannine writings which were current during the first half of the second century" (p. 57).

PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF RELIGION: A Series of Lectures. By JOHN WATSON. 8vo. Pp. xxvi, 485. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$3.00, *net*.

These seventeen lectures cover a wide range of subjects, and convey a vast amount of information, apart from the author's direct discussion of the subject, whose aim is to establish the theory of Constructive Idealism, which regards the physical world as having no independent being, but as merely a phase in the life of mind, refusing to see in it the final revelation of the divine.

The historical portions of the volume, in which the author considers the views of Harnack, the relation of Philo to the New Testament, Gnostic theology, Augustine's phases of faith, medieval theology, and Leibnitz and Protestant theology, are especially valuable.

At the outset the author affirms that "the appeal to external

authority does not in our day carry conviction even to those who make it." (p. v). And yet in his later discussions he is ready to admit that, as in science we accept the opinion of experts, so it may be in spiritual matters. Does not this give the orthodox believer all the basis he needs for his defense of the Bible? Historical facts certainly are established upon the testimony of others. The original witnesses of Christ's life are authorities whose testimony the reason cannot discard.

ROOTS OF REALITY; Being Suggestions for a Philosophical Reconstruction. By ERNEST BELFORT BAX. 8vo. Pp. xi, 331. New York: B. W. Dodge and Company. \$2.00.

According to the author, the "absolutely unassailable principle at the basis of what is known as Modern Idealism, is, that conscious experience, possible or actual, embraces all that is or can be; that the postulation of existence independent of consciousness is meaningless, being in fact a contradictory absurdity" (p. 288). This paradoxical thesis is defended with great vigor and acumen, and unusual interest is given to the discussion.

ÉTUDES SUR LA DOCTRINE DE DIEU. Par P. LOBSTEIN, Professeur à la Faculté de Théologie de Strasbourg. Première Serie. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher; Lausanne: Georges Brindel et C^{le}. 1907.

Some time ago Dr. Bouvier's "Dogmatique Chrétienne" was reviewed in these pages. It was pointed out that the chief characteristic of that work was the fact that the divine life was made the central fact of a theological system. Consciously or unconsciously Dr. Lobstein is a disciple of Dr. Bouvier's. The religious life and consciousness of man is made the foundation upon which the whole discussion of the attributes of God is built as a superstructure.

Dr. Lobstein is well aware that his method is a wide departure from the ordinary. He says in the Preface: "Le point de vue exposé ici est loin de prévaloir dans la théologie régnante," and speaks of "la substitution de la méthode or-

ganique à la méthode atomistique." Later on, in the discussion proper, he says: 'Religious faith knows the God who enters into communion with her, and Christian theology applies itself to express this relation. But let us take heed lest we confound the description with the demonstration. . . . The immense majority of theologians take the psychological phenomenon to be the transcendental reality. They are under an illusion as to the value of their systems, attributing to them a content objective and absolute when they have really only a relative and formal value.' The advantage of this method is apparent as soon as one reads such a discussion or relates it to vital religious perplexity. Thus treated, the science of theology is not dry. Every page is warm with life. The discussion is not far away, "up in the air," but near at hand. Especially for the preacher is such discussion valuable. It affords him the finest possible kind of sermonic ore.

From this point of view the author presents five studies; viz. The Eternity, Omnipresence, Omniscience, Omnipotence, and Personality of God. These studies were published originally in *La Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*. We wonder if the publishers could not be prevailed upon to supply an index. The Table des Matières is insufficient.

FREDERICK W. HASS.

AUX CROYANTS ET AUX ATHÉES. Par WILFRED MONOD. Pp. 320. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher.

This unusual title belongs to a book consisting of four addresses on practical religious problems, together with a doctrinal study called "Le Problème de Dieu." The addresses, entitled successively "Que Faire"; "Comment Lire L'Évangile"; "L'Atheisme Moderne: Est-Il Irreligieux"; "Un Athée," were delivered before four quite different audiences, and reflect this fact. But whether he is speaking to a body of ministers or to a popular audience, the author makes it clear that his standpoint is that of a working pastor dealing with the practical problems of the French church. In this respect it is important to note the concessions made to Socialism. They

are much greater than the church in America is ready to make. The author at different times points out the need of social reform along the lines of Socialism. In this work the church is to take the lead. In other respects, also, the book gives us an interesting inside view of conditions in the Protestant church in France.

In the doctrinal essay, the author attacks the accepted dogma of the omnipotence of God. His point of departure is the difficulty he has of harmonizing divine omnipotence with the idea of a moral God. His conclusion is that the observable world is not directly the work of a supreme God, but rather of a subordinated although automatic causality.

FREDERICK W. HASS.

LA NOTION DE L'ESPRIT. Sa Genèse et son Evolution dans la Théologie Chrétienne. Tome Première. LA DOCTRINE PAULINIENNE. Par JEAN ARNAL, Licencié en théologie 8vo. Pp. 361. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher.

We have here the first volume of a really important work. It is a painstaking, careful attempt to trace the development of the Christian conception of the Holy Spirit. The author is cautious in his statements, evidently attempting to portray with impartiality. It is a most excellent example of historico-religious literature, with Ritschlian tendencies.

There are some very fine discussions of special topics and stages which are met in the history of the development of this conception among the people of God. Especially noteworthy are the discussions on *ruach* and *nephesh*, on Philo, on the Apocrypha, on *σῶμα* and *σάρξ*, and on "redemption."

The fundamental doctrines of Christianity must be restated for each succeeding generation or age. Systematic theology can therefore never be neglected without disaster to the church. There are increasing signs that this branch of theology is emerging from the partial eclipse from which it seemed for a time to suffer. It is inevitable that it shall again come into its own, richer, stronger, and better because of the wealth of historical and scientific matter which has been gathered in recent years.

This book belongs to the newer age. A second volume is to follow; in which elements, other than the Pauline, which have entered into the growth of this conception in the church, will be given the same adequate treatment.

FREDERICK W. HASS.

CHRIST AND THE ETERNAL ORDER. By JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM. 12mo. Pp. xii, 190. Boston: The Pilgrim Press. \$1.00.

In this suggestive volume of high literary order, our quondam contributor justifies to himself and to the world his belief in the divinity and humanity of Christ, and in the enduring influence of our Lord's personality. No one can read the chapters without interest and without spiritual quickening. The reasonableness of the miracles of the New Testament is thus happily stated: "The personality of Jesus is the greater miracle and carries the other miracles with it. . . . To explain the miracles away is quite as difficult as to explain them. . . . They are notes of a deeper harmony which underlies apparent confusion and discords" (p. 36).

JESUS CHRIST THE SON OF GOD. By WILLIAM MALCOLM MACGREGOR. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

As a collection of sermons, this volume has the advantage of combining unity with variety. The person of Christ unites so many elements that there is room for the preparation of countless sermons upon it without danger of monotony. The twenty-five discourses here collected are all marked by freshness and originality. Such sermons furnish the best sort of a commentary.

THE LORD OF GLORY: A Study of the Designations of our Lord in the New Testament, with Special Reference to his Deity. By BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary. 8vo. Pp. 332. New York: The American Tract Society. \$1.50, *net*.

In this closely packed volume the reader will find an unanswerable defense of the orthodox conception of the person and

work of Christ, and this in a constructive method of treatment. The designation of our Lord in the Gospels and in the Acts and Epistles are exhaustively treated, and their significance is thoroughly and satisfactorily discussed. Every modern phase both of skepticism and belief has been considered. No preacher or student can afford to frame his opinions upon this subject without having studied this remarkable product of orthodox scholarship, which is in reality a condensed and lucid commentary upon the whole New Testament.

NEW HOROSCOPE OF MISSIONS. By REV. JAMES SHEPARD DENNIS. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. \$1.00, *net*.

This standard authority upon modern missions has greatly enriched the subject by these five lectures, of which the titles are: "A New World-Consciousness," "Strategic Aspects of the Missionary Outlook," "A New Cloud of Witnesses," "Fresh Annals of the Kingdom," and "The Message of Christianity to Other Religions."

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LOYALTY. By JOSIAH ROYCE. 12mo. Pp. xiii, 409. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.50, *net*.

Dr. Royce finds it difficult to define loyalty, which he says "is the fulfillment of the whole moral law." This is of course too general to be of any service. More specifically, he gives, as a preliminary definition, "the willing and practical and thoroughgoing devotion of a person to a cause" (p. 16). But here comes "the rub." How shall we determine to what cause our loyalty should be devoted? This naturally leads our author to a discussion of the fundamental principles of moral science. In the chapter on "Some American Problems," some wholesome lessons are taught concerning our duty to honor those who are placed in positions of official responsibility, even though they belong to a party different from our own. As he says, "The observer of a Presidential canvass can hardly think of that canvass as a religious function or be-

lieve that a profound reverence for the sacred memory of the Fathers is at present a very prominent factor in determining our choice of the party for which we shall vote at the polls" (p. 236).

In a chapter on "Loyalty to Truth and Reality," the author gives Professor James's doctrine of Pragmatism some hard hits. Truth is an objective thing for its own sake, and is not the mere goal of a successful effort to satisfy one's desires.

WYCLIFFE AND THE LOLLARDS. (World's Epoch Makers Series.) By REV. J. C. CARRICK. 12mo. Pp. 329. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, Imported. \$1.25.

An interesting and well-proportioned history of most influential Reformers before the Reformation. But for Wycliffe and his poor Lollard preachers, the history of England and of the modern world would have been very different from what it is. The interest felt in Wycliffe's translation of the Bible is shown in the fact that a single copy was sold in 1899 for seven-hundred and fifty pounds.

GOD'S CHOICE OF MEN. By WILLIAM R. RICHARDS. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.50, *net*.

Those who have accepted the popular caricatures of the Westminster Confession will find this volume of Sermons upon God's election of men a wholesome corrective of popular misconceptions. The discourses have the advantage of being readable, and of treating profound themes in such a way that the profundity is not oppressive.

THE CHURCH OF TO-DAY. By JOSEPH HENRY CROOKER. 12mo. Pp. 177. Boston: The Pilgrim Press. 1908. 70 cents, *net*.

Here is a real contribution to the literature of a great subject. The writer feels keenly the modern neglect of the church and makes an eloquent plea in this compact volume for a new loyalty to the church of God. He describes his purpose to induce "a clearer understanding and a deeper conviction of the need and worth of the Christian church as an institution,"

and in a day which is emphasizing social service and humanitarian effort in every line so effectively, but often in total disregard of the historic institution which has ever been the inspirer of all such effort, such a plea is surely timely.

A few of the captions indicate his trend of thought: "Religion Grows but the Church Declines," "Obstacles in the Way of the Church," "Religion as a Corporate Life," "What Creates the Church," "What the Church Contributes," "More Needed than Ever," "Sinners Inside and Saints Outside," "Jesus and His Church." Handling some of the modern abuses of the church with keen incisiveness, the writer is constructively critical of the church and its work, but with the true spirit of one who "loved the church and gave himself for it" with deep sympathy he suggests many needed changes in the modern church's program. With frequent telling illustrations and a well-enforced argument to sustain his thesis he splendidly maintains his plea for a renewed devotion to the great historic institution to which Christendom owes so much. The writer's style is refreshingly unconventional, abounding in epigrams and balanced sentences which are both terse and true, and full of suggestiveness. The book is not likely to reach those who need it most, but it will furnish many with shafts of light and clinching logic to be quoted effectively.

SUNDAY-SCHOOLS THE WORLD AROUND. The Official Report of the World's Fifth Sunday-School Convention in Rome, May, 1907. Edited by PHILIP E. HOWARD. Philadelphia, Pa.: G. W. Bailey.

A book of special interest to the eleven hundred delegates whose journey to "the Eternal City" is herein described, but also of value to Sunday-school workers everywhere, who will find in the stenographically reported addresses much interesting information regarding Bible-study work the world over and practical suggestions on Sunday-school methods. The book is very fully illustrated and well indexed. The style is popular.

INDEX.

A

- Allen's, W. C., Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew, noticed, 593.
 Andover Seminary, Removal of, note on, 386.
 Apologetics, Use and Abuse of, note on, 374-379.
 Arnal's, J., *Notion de l'Esprit*, noticed, 772.
 Authority in Religion, Ground of, note on, 759-761.
 Avery's, E. M., History of the United States and its People, noticed, 599.

B

- Baljon, J. M. S., article by, 1-39.
 Barton, G. A., book reviews, 395, 580-590.
 Bax's, E. B., *Roots of Reality*, noticed, 770.
 Beecher's, W. J., *Dated Events of the Old Testament*, noticed, 595.
 Berle, A. A., notes by, 158-169; articles by, 306-330, 445-451.
 Biology and Fatalism, article on, by J. T. Gulick, 358-367; Spencer's denial of human freedom, 358; environment does not make the organism, 359; three forms of Selection, 360; changing instincts, 361; filio-parental Selection, 362; institutional Selection, 363; acquired characteristics, 364; Natural Selection checked by art, 365; deterioration through Natural Selection, 365; even snails have incipient freedom, 367.
 Books Received, 191.
 Breasted's, J. H., *History of the Ancient Egyptians*, noticed, 766.

- Brown's, W. A., *Christian Theology in Outline*, noticed, 174-176.
 Brunetière and the Novel of Real Life, article on, by H. A. Stimson, 40-56; group of modern French critics, 40; Brunetière's point of view, 41; contempt for Zola, 43; for Malot, 43; fault of the realistic school, 45; errors of Romanticism, 46; when is literature immoral, 47; superficiality in literature, 50; Balzac's position, 51; English novels, 52; English and French realism, 54; need of the times, 56.
 Buckham's, J. W., *Christ and the Eternal Order*, noticed, 773.

C

- Campbell, G., article by, 572-585.
 Carrick's, J. C., *Wycliffe and the Lollards*, noticed, 775.
 Cheetham's, S., *History of the Christian Church*, noticed, 592.
 Christ that is to be, noticed, 597.
Churchman, noticed, 600.
 Circumcision among the Samaritans, article on, by Jacob, Son of Aaron, 694-710.
 Clark, F. C., article by, 249-305.
 Clay's, A. T., *Legal and Commercial Transactions*, noticed, 590.
 Critical Notes, 158-173.
 Criticism, A Remarkable Claim on Behalf of the Radical, article on, by W. M. McPheeters, 679-693; claim that Radical Criticism is favorable to religion, 679; question of fact, 682; Harper's testimony to the contrary, 683; Mrs. Houghton's testimony, 685; testimony of the *Interior*, 686; of Professor Kent, 687; of Professor Zenos, 688; of Goldwin Smith, 690;

- of F. Delitzsch, 692; the conflict irrepressible and all-important, 693.
 Criticism, Pentateuchal, articles on, by H. M. Wiener, 481-509, 723-754.
 Criticism, Science and Higher, article on, by F. J. Lamb, 57-86.
 Critics, Homer and the Higher, article on, by W. W. Everts, 531-556.
 Crooker's, J. H., Church of Today, noticed, 775.
 Cunningham, J. O., article by, 656.
 Curtis, A. B., note by, 755-759.

D

- Dale's, R. W., History of English Congregationalism, noticed, 177.
 Dennison, W., book review by, 399.
 Dennis's, J. S., New Horoscope of Missions, noticed, 774.
 Dhorme's, P., *Choix de Textes Religieux Assyro-Babyloniens*, noticed, 395.
 Donaldson's, J., Woman, noticed, 399.

E

- Edwards's, M., Summary of the Literatures of Modern Europe, noticed, 189-191.
 Egypt, Jewish Temple in, B.C. 525-411, note on, 170-173.
 Egypt, Plagues of, articles on, by E. M. Merrill, 407-420, 611-635.
 Engert's, T., *Ehe- und Familienrecht der Hebräer*, book review on, 388-391.
 England, Theological Unrest in, note on, 379-386.
 English Dramatic Verse after Shakespeare, article on, by T. W. Hunt, 132-147; a period of decline, 132; early Stuart and Puritan periods, 134; the later Stuart drama, 136; the eighteenth-century drama, 141; the nineteenth-century drama, 145; contemporary British drama, 146.

- Ethical Factor in Politics, article on, by F. L. Hayes, 148-157.
 Everts, W. W., article on, 531-556.
 Evolution and the Miraculous, article on, by G. Campbell, 572-585; what is evolution, 573; what is God, 575; what is man, 576; what is a miracle, 578; necessity for the miraculous, 579; historical validation, 581; final evidence, 584.

F

- Fiske, G. W., article by, 465-480.
 Flournoy, P. P., article by, 657-678.
 Forsyth's, P. T., Positive Preaching and Modern Mind, noticed, 596.

G

- Genesis, "Fourth Day" in, note on, 169.
 Gibson's, W. R. B., Rudolf Eucken's Philosophy of Life, noticed, 179.
 Gordon's, A. R., Early Traditions of Genesis, noticed, 587.
 Gospels, Real Date of the, by P. P. Flournoy, 657-678; prevalent view, 657; new light on the question, 658; tradition indefinite, 659; early need of the Gospels, 659; quotations not to be expected, 660; Professor Blass advocates an early date, 661; views of Bernhard Weiss, 662; evidence of the early date of the Fourth Gospel, 662; the Synoptics still earlier, 664; Alford's views, 665; Sanday's views, 666; Matthew and Luke not dependent on Mark, 667; Greek used by Christ, 669; inspiration does not interfere with individuality, 670; Ramsay's views, 671; internal evidence of early date, 673; tradition untrustworthy, 674; the Gospels preceded the Epistles, 675; Greek and Roman classics not quoted early, 676; contemporary writing the best evidence, 677.

- Granrud's, J. E., Roman Constitutional History, noticed, 599.
 Gregg's, D., Between the Testaments, noticed, 596.
 Gulick, J. T., article by, 358-367.
 Guthrie's, E. G., Significance of the Personality of Christ for the Minister of To-day, noticed, 598.

H

- Hall's, H. F., Inward Light, noticed, 600.
 Harrison, W., article by, 331-357.
 Hartranft's, C. D., Study of the Earliest Letters of Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig, noticed, 396.
 Hartzog's, W. B., Ancient Masters and Jesus, noticed, 189.
 Hass, F. W., book reviews by, 770-773.
 Hastings's, J., Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, noticed, 594.
 Hayes, F. L., article by, 148-157.
 Higher Criticism, Science and, article on, by F. J. Lamb, 57-86.
 Homer and Higher Critics, article on, by W. W. Everts, 531-556; rise of higher criticism, 531; current opinions in the eighteenth century, 534; Wolf's influence, 535; internal evidence, 537; popularity of the theory, 539; questionings, 542; increasing skepticism, 545; reaction among the philologists, 546; death-blow to the theory, 553; paralleled by Pentateuchal criticism, 555.
 Hubbard's, G. H., Teachings of Jesus in Parables, noticed, 187.
 Hunt, T. W., article by, 132-147.
 Hutchins, W. J., article by, 452-464.

I

- Immanence, Some Perils of Current Views of, article on, by G. S. Rollins, 87-96; immanence defined, 87; relation to pantheism, 89; a transcendent

God, 90; immanence in human freedom, 91; immanence and the existence of evil, 92; cannot obliterate the personality of God, 93; the possibility of miracles, 94; authority of the Scriptures, 95; transcendence and immanence, 96.

- Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents, review of Kent's book on, by H. M. Wiener, 97-131: Kent's ignorance of legal nomenclature, 97, 104; his misstatements of facts, 98; continued, 100; defective bibliography, 101; humiliating errors concerning references to the king and state, 107; honor and obedience due parents, 109; marriage of the captive, 110; seduction and rape, 110; different kinds of slaves, 111; rights and duties of aliens, 111; conveyance of real property, 111; the law of primogeniture, 112; the right of daughters to inherit, 113; the division of booty, 113; ignorant of non-sacrificial slaughter, 114; not all altars outside of the central one interdicted, 115; existence of lay altars, 116; origin of the priesthood, 117; Levites could hold property, 118; cities of refuge, 119; development of archaic laws, 120; law relating to first-fruits, 122; the laws of Hammurabi, 124; comparative study of ancient law, 125; other instances of ignorance and misrepresentation, 129.

J

- Jaussens, A., Coutumes des Arabes au Pays de Moab, noticed, 588-590.
 Justification by Faithfulness, note on, 755-759.

K

- Kent's, C. F., Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents, reviewed, 97-131.
 Kuyper, A., note on, 374-379.

L

- Lamb, F. J., article by, 57-86.
 Laymen, The Minister and his Training of his, article on, by G. W. Fiske, 465-480.
 Lea's, H. C., Inquisition in the Spanish Dependencies, noticed, 598.
 Leighton's, J. A., Jesus Christ and the Civilization of To-day, noticed, 182.
 Lewis's, F. G., Irenaeus Testimony to the Fourth Gospel, noticed, 769.
 Life and Light, noticed, 596.
 Lincoln, Recollections of, article on, by J. O. Cunningham, 636-656; perennial interest in Lincoln, 636; his humble birth, 637; adverse surroundings of his childhood and early manhood, 637; his life upon the circuit, 639; his intimacy with Judge Davis, 640; effect of his association with the common people, 641; the Bloomington Convention, 643, 652; the meeting in the Sangamon woods, 644; his great qualities of leadership, 645; incidents showing his natural simplicity, 647; his contest with Judge Douglas, 650, 654.
 Lindsay, J., book reviews by, 179-181, 189-191; article by, 711-722.
 Lobstein's, P., *Etudes sur la Doctrine de Dieu*, noticed, 770.
 London, Poverty and Vice of, note on, 368-374.

M

- Macgregor's, W. M., Jesus Christ the Son of God, noticed, 773.
 Magoun, H. W., note by, 169; book review by, 599.
 Martin, C. B., book review by, 598.
 Mathew's, S., Church and the Changing Order, noticed, 186.
 McPheeters, W. M., article by, 679-693.
 Merrins, E. M., book review by, 183-185; articles by, 401-429, 611-635.

- Minister and his Training of his Laymen, article on, by G. W. Fiske, 465-480; democracy of Congregationalism, 465; necessity for lay coöperation, 467; an atrophied function: the local bishop, 469; embarrassments of modern critical taste, 471; expert training of laymen required, 473; different groups for special training, 475; the pastor: the church specialist, 479.
 Ministerial Training, Moore on, article on, by A. A. Berle, 445-451; ministry a practical calling, 446; causes of failure, 447; ethical problems, 448; social problems, 449; objects of scholarship, 450.
 Miraculous, Evolution and the, article on, by G. Campbell, 572-585.
 Miskovsky, L. F., article by, 510-530.
 Monod's, W., *Aux Croyants et aux Athées*, noticed, 771.

N

- New England Theology, Alleged Collapse of, article on, 601-610; five truths prominent in New England theology, 602; the authority of the Bible, 603; the greatness of man, 603; the depth of his depravity, 604; the exalted nature of Christ, 605; strength and tenderness of the love and mercy of God, 606.
 New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, noticed, 767.
 New Testament, Contributions from the History of Religions to the, article on, by J. M. S. Baljon, 1-39; interrelations of the subject, 2; the Babel-Bible conflict, 3; the New Testament involved, 4; fixed points in the discussion, 5; influence of Hellenism, 6; apocalyptic literature, 9; Babylonian mythological representations, 11; Buddhist and Christian nar-

ratives, 13; births of Jesus and Buddha, 14; contrasts in the narratives, 18; the Mithras cult and Christianity, 19; characteristics of the Mithras cult, 21; parallelisms with Christianity, 23; symbolism common to the two, 25; common mysteries, 27; Tertullian's views, 28; Augustine's views, 31; the Mithras liturgy, 32; relation to the Logos doctrine, 34; independence of New Testament conceptions, 35; magical use of Jesus' name in baptism, 36; parallels with the Lord's Supper, 37; conclusion, 38.

Notes, 368-387, 755-762.

Notices of Recent Publications, 174-192, 388-400, 586-600, 763-776.

O

O'Malley's, A., *Essays in Pastoral Medicine*, noticed, 183-185.

P

Park, W. E., note by, 386.

Pentateuchal Criticism, articles on, by H. M. Wiener, 481-500, 723-754; deficiencies of the higher critics, 481; the Oxford Hexateuch, 482; critical theories, 483; Egypt or Goshen, 484; the story of Moses, 487; Moses and Aaron or Moses, 491; the ministry of the sanctuary, 494; the rod, 497; the plagues, 499; the so-called literary evidence, 505; crossing of the Red Sea, 729, 743; the pillar of cloud, 723; no contradiction in Ex. xvi. 10, 725; manufactured contradictions, 727; the cloud at Sinai, 728; Ex. xxiv. 15b, 728; Ex. xxxiii. 7, 728; Num. x. 34, 728; no real discrepancies, 729; the Glory, 730; position of the ark, 731; the Tent of Meeting, 734; order of encampments, 736; Ex. xxxiii. 7, 738; Num. xi. and xii., 741; doublets manufactured in Ex.

xvii., 745; Ex. xxxiii. 7-11, 747; Ex. xix., 748; Ex. xxxii., 748; Ex. xxxiii., 749; Num. xi. 4-34, 750; duplicate quails, natural, 750; Imbecility of the redactors, 752; Moses' trials, 752; undivided narrative, natural, 753.

Plagues of Egypt, articles on, by E. M. Merrins, 401-429, 611-635; present materialistic tendencies, 401; rationality of the Exodus, 404; influence of physical disasters, 406; the first plague, 408; the second, 412; the third and fourth plagues, 417; the fifth plague, 419; the sixth, 420; the seventh, 611; the eighth, 613; the ninth, 615; the tenth, 621.

Politics, *The Ethical Factor in*, article on, by F. L. Hayes, 148-157; increasing power of, 148; the purification of politics, 151; the independent voter, 152; politicians turn preachers, 153; safety of public morals a primary concern of government, 154; the decalogue and the Golden Rule still authoritative, 156.

Preacher and the Times, *The*, article on, by W. J. Hutchins, 452-464; present discontent, 453; panaceas, 454; emphasis upon personality, 455; effects of criticism, 457; ministry magnified, 458; wants of humanity, 459; the kind of preacher needed, 462.

Presbyterianism, *Short History of American*, noticed, 178.

Price's, I. M., *Ancestry of our English Bible*, noticed, 187.

Psychologizing, *Romantic*, note on, 158-169.

R

Radical Criticism, *A Remarkable Claim on Behalf of the*, article on, by W. M. McPheeters, 679-693.

Ramsay's, W. M., *Cities of St. Paul*, noticed, 593.

Rauschenbusch's, W., *Christian-*

- ity and the Social Crisis, noticed, 185.
- Real Life, Brunetière and the novel of, article on, by H. A. Stimson, 40-56.
- Religions, Contributions from the History of, to the New Testament, article on, by J. M. S. Baljon, 1-39.
- Richards's, W. R., God's Choice of Men, noticed, 775.
- Rix's, H., Tent and Testament, noticed, 189.
- Rogers's, A. K., Religious Conception of the World, noticed, 181.
- Rollins, G. S., article by, 87-96.
- Rome, Reflections in, article on, by J. Lindsay, 711-722; general view, 711; the Janiculum Hill and Capitoline Museum, 712; the Forum, 713; the Colosseum, 14; Palatine Hill, 715; Castel S. Angelo, 716; Forum of Trajan, 717; Michael Angelo, 718; Raphael, 719; Greek influence, 720; Applan Way, 720; Roman cruelty, 722; contrast of Christianity, 722.
- Root, A. S., book review by, 396.
- Royce's, J., Philosophy of Loyalty, noticed, 774.
- break the Sabbath, 436; the sin of gathering manna on the Sabbath, 440; the Jewish Sabbath fire, 440; concerning fire kindled before, but permitted to burn on the Sabbath, 441; purity of the Sabbath, 442.
- Samaritans, Circumcision among the, article on, by Jacob, Son of Aaron, 694-710; introductory note, 694; a treatise on circumcision, 695; circumcision on the eighth day, 695; an uncircumcised child to be slain, 696; differences in the habits of the Jews, 696; how the act is performed, 697; the hymn of circumcision, 698; the mention of Germon, 699; naming the boy, 701; the argument against the Jews, 702; the circumcision of the son of Moses, 703; how the Jews dishonor Moses, 704; another Jewish insult to Moses, 704; the Samaritan interpretation, 704; the Jews libel Zipporah, 706; a summary of the errors of the Jews, 707; the reason for Moses' divorce from his wife, 709.
- Sanborn, F. B., article by, 193-213.

S

- Sacrifice of Christ as a Ransom paid to the Devil, note on, 761.
- Samaritan Sabbath, article on, by Jacob, Son of Aaron, 430-444; introductory note, 430; how the Samaritans observe the Sabbath, 430; the preparation on Friday, 431; the assembling on Friday evening, 431; the prayers of the Sabbath, 431; the sabbatical divisions of the Torah, 432; the Sabbath hymns, 433; the mid-day service, 434; the evening prayer, 434; the seven Sabbath prayers, 435; the argument, 435; the Sabbath ordinances, 436; rest on the Sabbath means to worship, 437; God alone gives time its moral significance, 437; the holiest hours, 438; how the Jews
- Schaff's, P., History of the Christian Church, noticed, 592.
- Science and Higher Criticism, article on, by F. J. Lamb, 57-86; higher criticism to-day, 57; test of its theories, 59; importance of defining the issue, 61; the issue proposed, 63; critics' proposed evidence examined, 64; the issues to be tried by evidence, 66; collateral issues of the critics, 67; unwarranted expedients of the critics, 71; compared to Ptolemaic epicycles, 73; authority of ancient documents, 75; manufactured partitions in narratives, 77; hypothesis must be exclusive, 80; use of the words Elohim and Jehovah, 81.
- Secularism, article on, by W. Harrison, 331-357; principles of secularism, 331; confessions

- of modern unbelief, 334; acknowledged insufficiency, 839; moral impotence, of secularism, 342; personal considerations, 345; character of Hume, 346; destructiveness of secularism, 349; Bismarck's testimony, 351; a Wall Street testimony, 354; political effects, 356.
- Seignobos's, C., *History of Ancient Civilization*, noticed, 598.
- Seymour's, T. D., *Life in the Homeric Age*, noticed, 398.
- Sheldon's, H. C., *Unbelief in the Nineteenth Century*, noticed, 176.
- Smith's, G. A., *Jerusalem*, noticed, 763-765.
- Smith's, P., *Luther's Table Talk*, noticed, 397.
- Stimson, H. A., article by, 40-56; note by, 761.
- Strong's, A. H., *Systematic Theology*, noticed, 591.
- "Suffer Little Children," article on, by H. K. Wagner, 214-248; passage misunderstood, 214; its true rendering, 216; a miracle of healing, 217; significance of laying on of hands, 219; prayer at miracles, 222; rebuke of the disciples, 226; incident not customary, 228; no blessing pronounced, 231; teachings of the Talmud, 232; the custom of laying on of hands, 234; the Hebrew term "bless," 237; spiritual significance of the incident, 238; significance of "come unto me," 241; infant baptism, not taught, 243; the "little children," not infants, 244; the true lesson, 247.
- Sunday-schools the World Around, noticed, 776.
- Swing, A. T., book reviews by, 174-178, 182, 392-395, 397.
- T
- Thirtle's, J. W., *Old Testament Problems*, noticed, 391.
- Toleration Movement, *The Rise of the*, article on, by F. C. Clark, 249-305; the reign of intolerance, 249; intolerance of the reformers, 250; sixteenth-century parties in England, 253; Anglican intolerance, 258; the Romish party under James, 260; relief sought in colonization, 262; the Puritan party, 266; Puritanism opposed to despotism, 268; Archbishop Laud, 269; platform of the Puritans, 271; harshness of Elizabeth, 273; its effect, 274; rise of the Non-conformists, 276; persecution of the Puritans, 278; Charles's promise of toleration, 280; Puritan emigration to America, 281; Roger Williams, 282; Puritan factions, 285; the Erastian doctrine, 286; the Independents, 289; Brownist principles, 292; the Westminster Assembly, 294; general dissatisfaction, 298; factions among the Independents, 300; Cromwell's influence, 302; religious liberty the result of interclashing interests, 304.
- Tri-Church Union, *Progress and Present Status of*, article on, by L. C. Warner, 557-571; origin of the movement, 557; articles of agreement, 558; annual conferences, 561; individual churches not affected, 562; the benevolent societies, 563; action of the Congregational Church, 564; report of the Committee of Twenty-eight, 564; of the Committee on Polity, 568; action of the Methodist Protestant Church, 570.
- U
- Unitas Fratrum, *The*, article on, by L. F. Miskovsky, 510-530; important rôle of Bohemia, 510; origin of Unitas Fratrum, 511; separation of the Bohemian Brethren, 515; their persecution, 516; secret of their power, 517; gradation of membership, 519; organization of clergy, 521; examination of

candidates, 524; probation of pastors, 526; lessons of their example, 529.

Universities and Social Advance, article on, by A. A. Berle, 306-330; decline of university influence, 306; universities and the criminal rich, 308; and the politically corrupt, 311; and professional ideals, 316; and the public schools, 324; opposition to democratic ideals, 330.

V

Völtner's, D., *Die Apostolischen Väter*, noticed, 392-395.

Vries, J. H. de, translation by, 1-30.

W

Wagner, H. K., article by, 214-248.

Ward's, C. T., *Gospel Development*, noticed, 187.

Warfield's, B. B., *Lord of Glory*, noticed, 713.

Warner, L. C., article by, 557-571.

Watson, J., *Philosophical Basis of Religion*, noticed, 769.

What Shall I Believe, noticed, 597.

Whittier, the Man, Poet, and Reformer, article on, by F. B. Sanborn, 193-213; his ancestry, 194; character of the Quakers, 195; father's political views, 196; his own favorite poets, 197; persecution of Quakers, 198; in the minority, 199; mob law, 200; becomes an abolitionist, 201; political activity, 203; writes for the *National Era*, 204; John Quincy Adams' influence, 205; early disunionist tendencies, 206; peaceable abolition impracticable, 207; secures the election of Charles Sumner, 208; poems of Nature, 209; his optimism, 211; Brown wiser than Whittier, 213.

Wiener, H. M., articles by, 97-131, 481-509, 723-754; note by, 388-391.

Winckler's, H., *History of Babylonla and Assyria*, noticed, 586.

Wright, C. H. H., *Light from Egyptian Papyrus*, noticed, 765.

Wright, G. F., notes by, 368-374, 379-386.

THE RECORDS OF THE PAST

PARTIAL CONTENTS—Volume VI., 1907.

- Climate and History in Western Asia (5 Illustrations). By E. Cutler Shedd.
- Development of the System of Boundary Fortifications in Britain and Germany under the Roman Empire. By George H. Allen.
- Troglodyte Dwellings of Bakhtchi-Sarai (11 Illustrations). By G. Frederick Wright.
- The McEvers Mounds, Pike County, Ill. (2 Illustrations). By Clara K. Bayliss.
- The Nebraska Loess Man (5 Illustrations). By Robert F. Gilder.
- Ancient Inhabitants of Nebraska (5 Illustrations). By Erwin H. Barbour.
- Roman North Africa (8 Illustrations). By C. Densmore Curtis.
- Prehistoric Man in Nebraska. By E. E. Blackman.
- Mound Builders of the Mississippi Valley (7 Illustrations). By Richard Herrmann.
- Palestine Exploration Fund. By Theodore F. Wright.
- A Primitive Cattle Shrine in Asia Minor (3 Illustrations). By George E. White.
- Nehawka Flint Quarries (6 Illustrations). By E. E. Blackman.
- The Autobiographic Element in Latin Literature and Inscriptions (5 Illustrations). By Henry H. Armstrong.
- Site of Ancient Persepolis (4 Illustrations). By Thomas F. Nelson.
- Preserving Wisconsin Mounds (2 Illustrations). By Frank A. Flower.
- Pre-Indian Inhabitants of North America (16 Illustrations). By Newton H. Winchell.
- Work of the Ohio Archaeological Society.
- Ancient Pottery Furnaces.
- Lead Furnaces. By Frank A. Flower.
- Soul-Houses in Egypt (8 Illustrations). By W. M. F. Petrie.
- Relics of the Stone Age from Taltal, Chile.
- Archæological Work of the University of California. By A. L. Kroeber.
- Amber in Asia.
- The Evolution of the Greek Fret (8 Illustrations). By Eunice G. Allyn.
- Greek Draped Figure at Vassar (6 Illustrations). By Edmund von Mach.
- Maya Ruins in Quintana Roo. By Count Maurice de Perigny.
- The Swastika. By Charles De W. Brower.
- The Hittite Capital, Boghaz-keuy and its Environs (12 Illustrations). By George E. White.
- New Light on Babylonian Chronology.
- The Rock of Cashel (4 Illustrations). By St. John Seymour.
- Interdependent Evolution of Oases and Civilizations.
- Egyptian Research Account.
- An Archæological Tour through Sicily with a Camera (22 Illustrations). By Edward W. Clark.
- The Beginnings of Iron.
- A Palæolithic Implement from the Loess (2 Illustrations). By Luella A. Owen.
- Roman Portrait Head in Vassar College (6 Illustrations). By Edmund von Mach.
- The Liver in Babylonian Divination (5 Illustrations). By Albert T. Clay.
- Adolf Furtwangler. By Edmund von Mach.
- Huntington's "Explorations in Central Asia" (5 Illustrations). By Frederick Bennett Wright.

Noteworthy Series of Articles in Late Numbers of the Bibliotheca Sacra

I. The Diseases of the Bible

By EDWARD M. MERRINS, M. D.

Biblical Epidemics of Bubonic Plague (April, 1904).

Deaths of Antiochus IV., Herod the Great, and Herod Agrippa I.
(July, 1904).

The Malady of Saul, King of Israel (October, 1904).

Did Jesus Die of a Broken Heart (January and April, 1905).

The Abasement of Nebuchadnezzar (October, 1905).

The Powers of Darkness (April and July, 1906).

The Patience of Job (April, 1907).

St. Paul's Thorn in the Flesh (October, 1907).

The Plagues of Egypt (July and October, 1908).

II. The Latest Translation of the Bible

By HENRY M. WHITNEY.

Problems and Difficulties (April, 1902).

Aims and Results (July, 1902).

From Another Standpoint (October, 1902).

Supplementary (January, 1903).

The Question of Modernness in the Light of Two Recent Examples
(April, 1903).

Additional Points—Chiefly as to Rhetorical Method (April, 1904).

Concerning Certain Other Versions, more or less in the Modern
(January, 1905).

A Few Final Tests (April, 1905).

Concerning Idiom (July, 1907).

III. A Jew's Unanswerable Defense of the Orthodox View of the Pentateuch

HAROLD M. WIENER, Esq.

Some Fatal Weaknesses of the Wellhausen School (January, 1907).

Hebrew Monotheism (October, 1907).

"Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents" (January, 1908).

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism (July and October, 1908).

Persons desiring these valuable papers can obtain them for 50 cents a number, or \$4.80 for First Series, \$3.60 for Second Series, and \$2.50 for Third Series; or \$10.50 for the years 1902-1908, inclusive.

Address,

Bibliotheca Sacra Co. OBERLIN, OHIO, U.S.A.

CHARLES HIGHAM & SON, LONDON, ENGLAND

